arXiv:1702.05369v1 [math.PR] 17 Feb 2017

On time scales and quasi-stationary distributions for multitype birth-and-death processes

J.-R. Chazottes [*1], P. Collet [†1], and S. Méléard [‡2]

[1]Centre de Physique Théorique, CNRS UMR 7644, F-91128 Palaiseau Cedex (France)
[2]Centre de Mathématiques Appliquées, CNRS UMR 7641, F-91128 Palaiseau Cedex (France)

Dated: February 20, 2017

Abstract

We consider a class of birth-and-death processes describing a population made of sub-populations of d different types which interact with one another. These processes are parametrized by a scaling parameter K giving the order of magnitude of the total size of the population. We consider a situation where the process stabilizes during a very long time around a transient equilibrium close to the fixed point of a naturally associated dynamical system, before going almost surely to extinction. We extend most of the results of our previous paper [3] which was about the case $d = 1$, that is, the monotype situation. We emphasize that we follow here a completely different route than the one followed in [3] which was in particular based on constructing a self-adjoint operator on a suitable ℓ^2-space out of the generator of the process. This contruction turns out to fail in higher dimension, as we explain below. In the present work, we rely upon an abstract result proved in [2] giving conditions under which one has exponential convergence of the process, conditioned on nonextinction, to the quasi-stationary distribution. In our situation, we obtain the precise dependence on K of the involved constants. As a consequence, we get an estimate of the mean time to extinction in the quasi-stationary distribution. We also quantify how close the law of the process is either to the Dirac measure at the origin or to the quasi-stationary distribution, for times much larger than $\log K$ and much smaller than the mean time to extinction, which grows exponentially with K. An important part of our work consists in a fine pathwise analysis of the process, with a precise dependence on K. In particular we use a Lyapunov function.

[*]Email: chazottes@cpht.polytechnique.fr
[†]Email: collet@cpht.polytechnique.fr
[‡]Email: sylvie.meleard@polytechnique.edu

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 Setting and standing assumptions **4**
2.1 The vector fields 4
2.2 An example 6
2.3 The stochastic process 7

3 Statements of the main results **8**

4 Some preparatory results **9**
4.1 A Lyapunov function 9
4.2 Lemma of the four domains. 11

5 Proof of Theorem 3.1. **14**
5.1 Plan for the proof: checking conditions (A1) and (A2) 14
5.2 Proof of Condition (A1) 14
5.3 Proof of Lemma 5.1 15
5.4 Proof of Lemma 5.2 22
5.5 Proof of Lemma 5.3 23
5.6 Proof of Condition (A2). 27
5.7 Proof of Theorem 3.1. 31

6 Proof of Theorem 3.2. **31**
6.1 Proof of the upper bound 31
6.2 Proof of the lower bound 33

7 Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4. **35**

8 Proof of Lemma 5.10 **39**

A A difference between monotype and multitype birth-and-death processes **47**

1 Introduction

We consider a class of birth-and-death processes describing a population made of a finite number of sub-populations of d different types which interact with one another. At each time t, the state of the process is given by a vector $\underline{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ describing the size of each sub-population. We also assume that these processes depend on a scaling parameter $K > 0$ giving the order of magnitude of the total size of the population (often refered as the carrying capacity). More precisely, if at some time t the population state is $\underline{n}$, the rate at which the population is increased (respectively decreased) by one individual of type $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ is $KB_j(\underline{n}/K)$ (respectively $KD_j(\underline{n}/K)$). We will introduce below hypotheses on the birth and death rates such that the total population goes extinct with probability one, but for large values of the parameter K (meaning that the population size is large), the process is close on finite time intervals to the solution of a dynamical system having a unique nontrivial stable fixed point. Under our hypotheses, the process stabilizes during a very long time around a transient equilibrium close to the fixed point of the dynamical system. Its statistical properties are closely related to the quasi-stationary distribution. Our goal is in particular to estimate as a function of K the time scale ($\Theta_0(K)$) at which the process goes extinct and the time scale ($\Theta_1(K)$) of convergence to the transient equilibrium, and to prove that for K large,

$$\Theta_0(K) \gg \Theta_1(K).$$

In other words, the process will stay in the transient state for a very long time before extinction.

This work is the natural extension of our work [3] on monotype (*i.e.*, $d = 1$) birth-and-death processes. In dimension one, we used a precise spectral analysis of a certain self-adjoint operator acting on a suitable "weighted" Hilbert space. Therein we obtained precise estimates of the two time scales, as well as the approximate behavior of the process in terms of a Gaussian distribution. These spectral techniques in Hilbert spaces are lost when $d \geq 2$ since the generator cannot be made self-adjoint, as explained in Appendix A. As a consequence, we shall follow here another method. We will apply a theorem proved in Champagnat-Villemonais [2]. This theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the exponential convergence of the process conditioned on non-extinction toward the quasi-stationary distribution. In our context, our task will be to obtain the precise dependence on K of the constants appearing in the result of Champagnat and Villemonais.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state our precise hypotheses, prove almost-sure extinction of the process and convergence (when K goes to infinity) on finite time intervals of the rescaled process to the solution of the differential system

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\underline{x}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \underline{B}(\underline{x}) - \underline{D}(\underline{x}), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, and $\underline{B}(\underline{x}) = (B_1(\underline{x}), \dots, B_d(\underline{x}))$ and $\underline{D}(\underline{x}) = (D_1(\underline{x}), \dots, D_d(\underline{x}))$.

The main results are given in Section 3. Colloquially speaking, we obtain that $\Theta_0(K) \geq \exp(\mathcal{O}(1)K)$, and $\Theta_1(K) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \log K$. We also obtain the convergence of the distribution of the process conditioned on non-extinction

to the quasi-stationary distribution with an exponential rate at least or order $\Theta_1(K)^{-1}$.

In Section 4, we construct a Lyapunov function for the generator of the process. We also prove a result (Lemma 4.3) giving quantitative bounds on the probability of the time the process takes to come down from one level set of the Lyapunov function to a lower one. We expect this quantitative result to be useful in more general situations.

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of the necessary and sufficient conditions required in [2]. We prove that it takes a time of order one for the process to "come down from infinity" and to arrive in a ball centered at $K\underline{x}^*$ whose radius is of order K, where $\underline{x}^*$ is the unique fixed point of the vector field $\underline{B}(\underline{x}) - \underline{D}(\underline{x})$. Then, it takes a time of order $\log K$ to arrive in a ball centered at $K\underline{x}^*$ whose radius is of order $\sqrt{K}$. Afterwards, it takes a time of order one for the distribution of the process to be bounded below (up to a multiplicative constant) by the uniform distribution on the ball of radius $\sqrt{K}$ centered at $K\underline{x}^*$.

2 Setting and standing assumptions

2.1 The vector fields

Throughout the paper, we will use the following basic notations. Elements of $\mathbb{R}^d_+$ will be denoted by $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$, and those of $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$ by $\underline{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d)$. For $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$, we will denote by $\|\underline{x}\|$ its Euclidean norm, by $|\underline{x}|$ its ℓ^1-norm, and by $d(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) = \|\underline{x} - \underline{y}\|$ the Eulidean distance between $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{y}$. The scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Given $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ and $r > 0$, the ball of radius r centered about $\underline{x}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\underline{x}, r)$.

We make the following hypotheses on the vector fields $\underline{B}$, $\underline{D}$ and $\underline{B} - \underline{D}$.

- The vector fields $\underline{B}$ and $\underline{D}$ are locally Lipschitz functions on $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, and

$$B_j(\underline{x}) \geq 0,\ D_j(\underline{x}) \geq 0,\ \forall j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \forall \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+ . \tag{H0}$$

- The vector fields $\underline{B}$ and $\underline{D}$ vanish only at the origin:

$$\underline{B}(\underline{x}) = 0 \iff \underline{D}(\underline{x}) = 0 \iff \underline{x} = \underline{0}. \tag{H1}$$

  The fixed point $\underline{0}$ of the vector field $\underline{B} - \underline{D}$ is linearly unstable.

- There exists $\underline{x}^* \in \mathrm{int}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)$ such that

$$\underline{B}(\underline{x}^*) - \underline{D}(\underline{x}^*) = \underline{0}. \tag{H2}$$

- There exist $\beta > 0$ and $R > L > 0$ such that

  (i) $\|\underline{x}^*\| < R$ and for all $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ such that $\|\underline{x}\| < R$

$$\langle \underline{B}(\underline{x}) - \underline{D}(\underline{x}), \underline{x} - \underline{x}^* \rangle \leq -\beta \, \|\underline{x}\| \, \|\underline{x} - \underline{x}^*\|^2 . \tag{H3}$$

  (ii) $\sum_{j=1}^d x_j^* < L$ and

$$\mathcal{B}\left(\underline{x}^*, \frac{1}{2} \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} x_j^*\right) \subset \left\{\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+ : |\underline{y}| \leq L\right\} \subset \mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, R) . \tag{H4}$$

We will denote by P_L the hyperplane defined by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d} x_j = L. \tag{2.1}$$

We refer to Figure 1 to help the reader visualizing how the different domains defined in Hypotheses (H3) and (H4) are organized.

- Moreover we assume that L is such that

$$\sup_{s>L} \frac{B_{\max}(s)}{D_{\min}(s)} < \frac{1}{2} \tag{H5}$$

where

$$D_{\min}(s) = \inf_{|\underline{x}|=s} \sum_{j=1}^{d} D_j(\underline{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{\max}(s) = \sup_{|\underline{x}|=s} \sum_{j=1}^{d} B_j(\underline{x}). \tag{2.2}$$

- We assume that $D_{\min}$ is an eventually monotone function such that

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{D_{\min}(s)} < +\infty\,. \tag{H6}$$

- There exists $\xi > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\underline{x}\in\mathbb{R}_+^d} \inf_{1\le j\le d} \frac{D_j(\underline{x})}{\sup_{1\le \ell\le d} x_\ell} > \xi > 0. \tag{H7}$$

- We assume that

$$\inf_{1\le j\le d} \partial_{x_j} B_j(\underline{0}) > 0. \tag{H8}$$

We now comment on the different hypotheses. Notice that the polynomial on the right-hand side in (H3) is natural locally around $\underline{0}$ and $\underline{x}^*$ from the Lipschitz property of the vector field. Hypothesis (H3) implies that the fixed point of $\underline{B} - \underline{D}$ is unique in $\mathbb{R}_+^d \cap \mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, R)\backslash\{\underline{0}\}$. Any trajectory starting in $\mathbb{R}_+^d \cap \mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, R)\backslash\{\underline{0}\}$ converges to $\underline{x}^*$. In particular, this implies that the faces of $\mathbb{R}_+^d$ are not globally invariant by the flow. Notice also that Hypothesis (H5) implies that there is no fixed point in $\mathbb{R}_+^d\backslash\mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, R)$. This hypothesis means that for large populations the death rates dominate the birth rates, this will be used together with Hypothesis (H6) to prove that the process "comes down from infinity".
We will see that Hypothesis (H7) implies that the jump rate of the process is bounded below away from zero.
We want the origin to be "sufficiently unstable". This is largely guaranted by Hypothesis (H8) which is likely to be too strong.
Finally, notice that Hypothesis (H3) (i) is an open condition in the C^2-topology of vector fields.



Figure 1: Illustration of Hypotheses (H3) and (H4)

2.2 An example

Let us first consider a neutral example. We define $S(\underline{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^d x_j$ and for every $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$B_j = \lambda S\,, \quad D_j = x_j(\mu + cS)\,,$$

where $\lambda > \mu/d > 0$ and $c > 0$. The non trivial fixed point $\underline{x}^*$ is given by $x_j^* = S^*/d$ where $S^* = (\lambda d - \mu)/c$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \underline{x} - \underline{x}^*, \underline{B} - \underline{D} \rangle &= \lambda S(S - S^*) - (\mu + cS)\Big(\|\underline{x} - \underline{x}^*\|^2 + (S - S^*)\frac{S^*}{d} \Big) \\ &= -\frac{c}{d}\, S(S - S^*)^2 - (\mu + cS)\left(\|\underline{x} - \underline{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{(S - S^*)^2}{d} \right).\end{aligned}$$

It is now convenient to use the decomposition

$$\underline{x} = \frac{S}{d}\,\underline{1} + \underline{y}$$

where $\underline{1}$ is the vector with all components equal to 1, and $\underline{y}$ is orthogonal to $\underline{1}$. We obtain (since $\underline{x}^* = S^*\,\underline{1}/d$)

$$\langle \underline{x} - \underline{x}^*, \underline{B} - \underline{D} \rangle = -\frac{c}{d}\, S(S - S^*)^2 - (\mu + cS)\, \|\underline{y}\|^2\,.$$

For $\underline{x}$ in the positive quadrant we have $\|\underline{x}\| \leq S$, hence

$$\|\underline{y}\| \leq S\,.$$

It is easy to verify that there exists a constant $\Gamma > 0$ such that for all $S \geq 0$ and all $\|\underline{y}\| \leq S$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\underline{x}\| \, \|\underline{x} - \underline{x}^*\|^2 &= \sqrt{\|\underline{y}\|^2 + S^2/d} \, \left(\frac{(S - S^*)^2}{d} + \|\underline{y}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \Gamma \left(\frac{c}{d} \, S \, (S - S^*)^2 + (\mu + cS) \, \|\underline{y}\|^2 \right) .\end{aligned}$$

which implies Hypothesis (H3) (i) with $\beta = 1/\Gamma$. Checking the other hypotheses is left to the reader.

Notice that Hypothesis (H3) (i) being an open condition in the C^2-topology of vector fields, one can construct many more examples by non neutral perturbations around this example.

2.3 The stochastic process

We consider the birth-and-death process $(\underline{N}^K(t), t \geq 0)$ on the d-dimensional integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$. Its birth and death rates are given by $KB_j\left(\frac{n}{K}\right)$ and $KD_j\left(\frac{n}{K}\right)$, $j = 1, \ldots, d$. Given $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with finite support, the generator of the process is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\mathcal{L}_K f\right)(\underline{n}) = \qquad (2.3)\\ &\quad K \sum_{j=1}^{d} \left[B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) \left(f(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{(j)}) - f(\underline{n}) \right) + D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) \left(f(\underline{n} - \underline{e}^{(j)}) - f(\underline{n}) \right) \right],\end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{e}^{(j)} = (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, the 1 being at the j-th position.

Proposition 2.1. *For each $K > 0$, the process $(\underline{N}^K(t), t \geq 0)$ goes to $\underline{0}$ with probability one.*

Proof. For a fixed K, the process $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d} (\underline{N}^K)_j(t), t \geq 0 \right)$ can be stochastically dominated by a monotype birth-and-death process with birth rate $KB_{\max}(m)$ and death rate $KD_{\min}(m)$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ (see (2.2)). Conditions (H5) and (H7) imply that the process $(\underline{N}^K(t), t \geq 0)$ goes almost surely to $\underline{0}$ (see [10, Theorem 5.5.5]). □

Under mild assumptions, one-parameter families of pure jump Markov processes can be approximated, in every finite time interval, by the solutions of a differential equation whose vector field is determined by the infinitesimal transition rates. This is referred to as Kurtz's theorem [9]. In our framework, this result takes the following form.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^d$ be an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}_+^d$. Fix a bounded time interval $[0, T]$ with $T > 0$. Let $\underline{x}_0 \in E$ be such that the trajectory of the solution $\underline{x}(t)$ of (1.1) with initial condition $\underline{x}_0$ belongs to E for all $t \in [0, T]$. If*

$$\lim_{K \to +\infty} \frac{\underline{N}^K(0)}{K} = \underline{x}_0,$$

then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{K \to +\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \frac{\underline{N}^K(t)}{K} - \underline{x}(t) \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$

We will use the following notation throughout the article.

Notation. *The first entrance time of the process* $(\underline{N}^K(t), t \geq 0)$ *in various subsets* A *of* $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ *is defined by*

$$\tau_A = \inf\{t > 0 : \underline{N}^K(t) \in A\}.$$

When A *is a singleton, say* $\{\underline{n}\}$*, we shall simply write* $\tau_{\underline{n}}$*.*

In the following, we will use the following standard notations: $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}$ will denote the law of the process given that $\underline{N}^K(0) = \underline{n}$, and, for a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ and a subset A of $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(A) = \sum_{\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d} \mu(\underline{m})\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(A)$.

3 Statements of the main results

Our first main result is about exponential convergence towards the (unique) quasi-stationary distribution, in total variation distance. Recall that the total variation distance between two probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ is

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \sup_{A \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+^d)} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|$$

where $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+^d)$ is the powerset of $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$.

Theorem 3.1. *There exist* $K_0 > 0$*,* $0 < c < 1$ *and* $0 < a < b < +\infty$ *such that the following result holds. For all* $K \geq K_0$*, there exist* $t_0(K) \in (a \log K, b \log K)$ *and a unique probability measure* $\mathfrak{m}_K$ *on* $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$ *such that for every probability measure* μ *on* $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$*, and for all* $t > 0$*, we have*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_\mu\big(\underline{N}^K(t) \in \cdot \,|\, t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) - \mathfrak{m}_K(\cdot)\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 2(1-c)^{\lfloor t/t_0(K) \rfloor}.$$

Note that $\Theta_1(K) \leq t_0(K)$. By a general result on quasi-stationary distributions (see for example [4] or [11]), the following limit exists:

$$\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(K) = \lim_{t \to +\infty} -\frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big). \tag{3.1}$$

This quantity is called the exponential rate of survival. The following theorem shows that it is exponentially small in K.

Theorem 3.2. *There exists* $K_0 > 0$ *and two numbers* $d_1 > d_2 > 0$ *such that for all* $K > K_0$

$$\mathrm{e}^{-d_1 K} \leq \lambda_0(K) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-d_2 K}.$$

The previous estimate thus gives an estimate of the mean time to extinction $\Theta_0(K)$ since one has $\Theta_0(K) = 1/\lambda_0(K)$. When $d = 1$, a more precise estimation was proved in our previous work [3, Theorem 3.2].

The following theorem provides a quantitative bound for the distance (in total variation) between the law of the process and a distribution of the process and a convex combination of the quasi-stationary distribution and the Dirac measure at the origin.

Theorem 3.3. *There exist four positive constants $C_{(3.3)}$, $c_{(3.3)}$, $\eta_{(3.3)}$, and K_0 such that, for all $t \geq 0$ and all $K > K_0$, there exists $\omega = \omega(K)$ satisfying*

$$\omega(K) \geq \frac{c_{(3.3)}}{\log K} .$$

Moreover, for each $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$, there exists a number $p_K(\underline{n}) \in (c, 1]$, where c is defined in Theorem 3.1, such that

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}} \left\| \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\underline{N}^K(t) \in \cdot) - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0 t}\, p_K(\underline{n})\, \mathfrak{m}_K(\cdot) - \big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0 t}\, p_K(\underline{n})\big)\delta_{\underline{0}}(\cdot) \right\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$$
$$\leq 2\, \mathrm{e}^{-\eta_{(3.3)} K}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0 t} + 3\, C_{(3.3)}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\omega t} \ .$$

This result gives a precise estimate for $t \gg \log K$. In other words, for $\log K \ll t \ll 1/\lambda_0(K)$ the law of the process is close to either the Dirac measure at the origin or the quasi-stationary distribution.

Let $(\mathcal{P}_t^K, t \geq 0)$ be the semigroup of the birth and death process killed at $\underline{0}$. More precisely

$$\mathcal{P}_t^K f(\underline{n}) = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}} \left[f(\underline{N}^K(t))\, \mathbb{1}_{\{t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\}} \right],$$

where $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\} \to \mathbb{R}$ is any bounded measurable function. We now prove that the spectral gap of this semigroup is larger than $\mathcal{O}(1)/\log K$, which is what we obtained in dimension one [3, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 3.4. *The resolvent of $(\mathcal{P}_t^K, t \geq 0)$ in the Banach space $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\})$ is meromorphic in the set $\Re z > -\omega(K)$ with a unique simple pole at $-\lambda_0(K)$ with residue the one dimensional projection π_K given by*

$$\pi_K(f) = \mathfrak{u}_K \mathfrak{m}_K(f) .$$

The sequence $\big(\mathfrak{u}_K(\underline{n})\big)_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}}$ satisfies $\mathfrak{m}_K(\mathfrak{u}_K) = 1$, for all $t \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{P}_t^K \mathfrak{u}_K = \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0 t}\, \mathfrak{u}_K \ ,$$

and for all $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$

$$c \leq \mathfrak{u}_K(\underline{n}) \leq 1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)K} ,$$

where c is defined in Theorem 3.1. In particular the spectral gap $\omega(K) - \lambda_0(K)$ satisfies

$$\omega(K) - \lambda_0(K) \geq \frac{c_{(3.3)}}{\log K} - \mathrm{e}^{-d_2 K} .$$

We emphasize that the bounds depend on the dimension d only through the constants.

4 Some preparatory results

4.1 A Lyapunov function

We first introduce the natural quantity

$$\underline{n}^* = \lfloor \underline{x}^* K \rfloor,$$

wich will appear throughout the article. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{Z}_+^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$\varphi(\underline{n}) = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{K}\|\underline{n}-\underline{n}^*\|^2} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a parameter to be chosen later on. We now prove that under the previous assumptions and for α small enough, the function φ is a Lyapunov function.

Theorem 4.1. *There exist $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, $K_0 > 0$ and $C_{(4.1)} > 0$ such that for all $K \geq K_0$ and for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, RK)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_K\varphi(\underline{n}) \leq \left(-\alpha\beta \, \frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K} \, \frac{\|\underline{n}-\underline{n}^*\|^2}{K} + C_{(4.1)} \right) \varphi(\underline{n}) \, ,$$

where β and R are defined in (H3).

Proof. We use the elementary fact that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|x| \leq R$ there exists $c_1(R) > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq e^x - 1 - x \leq C_1(R)x^2.$$

Then, for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{B}(0, RK)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathcal{L}_K\varphi(\underline{n})}{\varphi(\underline{n})} \\
&= K \sum_{j=1}^d \left[B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\left(\frac{\varphi(\underline{n}+\underline{e}^{(j)})}{\varphi(\underline{n})} - 1\right) + D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\left(\frac{\varphi(\underline{n}-\underline{e}^{(j)})}{\varphi(\underline{n})} - 1\right)\right] \\
&= K \sum_{j=1}^d \Big[B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\left(\exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{K}(2(n_j - n_j^*)+1)\right) - 1\right) \\
&\qquad + D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\left(\exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{K}(-2(n_j - n_j^*)+1)\right) - 1\right)\Big] \\
&= K \sum_{j=1}^d \left[2\alpha \left(B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) - D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\right)\left(\frac{n_j - n_j^*}{K}\right)\right. \\
&\qquad + \left(B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) + D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\right)\frac{4C_1(R)\alpha^2\|\underline{n}-\underline{n}^*\|^2}{K^2} \\
&\qquad \left. + \left(B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) + D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\right)\left(\frac{\alpha}{K} + \frac{2C_1(R)(n_j - n_j^*)}{K^2} + \frac{C_1(R)\alpha^2}{K^2}\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

Using (H0) and (H1), there exists $C_2(R) > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) + D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) \leq C_2(R)\frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K}$$

for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, RK)$. It is easy to verify that the third term in the square bracket is bounded in absolute value by a constant independent of K provided K is larger than some $K_0 > 0$. The second term in the square bracket is bounded by

$$4dC_2(R)\,\alpha^2 \frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K} \frac{\|\underline{n}-\underline{n}^*\|^2}{K} \, . \tag{4.2}$$

We finally deal with the first term in the square bracket. Writing $\underline{F} = \underline{B} - \underline{D}$ for brevity, we obtain by (H3)

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\alpha K \sum_{j=1}^{d} \left(B_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) - D_j\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)\right)\left(\frac{n_j - n_j^*}{K}\right) \\
&\quad = 2\alpha K \left\langle \underline{F}\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right), \frac{\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*}{K}\right\rangle \\
&\quad = 2\alpha K \left\langle \underline{F}\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right), \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} - \underline{x}^*\right)\right\rangle + 2\alpha K \left\langle \underline{F}\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right), \left(\underline{x}^* - \frac{\underline{n}^*}{K}\right)\right\rangle \\
&\quad \leq -2\alpha\,\beta K \frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K}\left\|\frac{\underline{n}}{K} - \frac{\underline{n}^*}{K}\right\|^2 + \mathcal{O}(1) \\
&\quad \leq -2\alpha\beta\,\frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K}\frac{\|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\|^2}{K} + \mathcal{O}(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\left\|\underline{x}^* - \frac{\underline{n}^*}{K}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{K}$ and $\underline{F}\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right)$ bounded on $\mathcal{B}(0,R)$, and where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is a quantity uniformly bounded in K. To finish the proof, we choose α small enough in such a way that the prefactor $4dC_2(R)\,\alpha^2$ in (4.2) is less than half of $2\alpha\beta$. □

Corollary 4.2. *There exist $K_0 > 0$ and two constants $\rho_{(4.2)} > 0$ and $c_{(4.2)} > 4$ such that, for all $K \geq K_0$ and for all $c_{(4.2)} \leq \|\underline{n}\| \leq RK$ satisfying*

$$\|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| \geq \rho_{(4.2)}\sqrt{K}$$

we have

$$\mathcal{L}_K\varphi(\underline{n}) \leq -\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K}\frac{\|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\|^2}{K}\,\varphi(\underline{n}).$$

Proof. We choose $c_{(4.2)}$ and $\rho_{(4.2)}$ large enough such that for $\underline{n}$ as in the statement, $\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K}\frac{\|\underline{n}-\underline{n}^*\|^2}{K} > C_{(4.1)}$. □

Remark 4.1. *The intuitive rate of decrease*

$$\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\frac{\|\underline{n}\|}{K}\frac{\|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\|^2}{K}$$

of the Lyapunov function, given by Corollary 4.2, is uniformly bounded below by the constant $C_{(4.1)}$, if $c_{(4.2)} \leq \|\underline{n}\| \leq RK$ and $\|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| \geq \rho_{(4.2)}\sqrt{K}$. However, if $\|\underline{n}\|$ and $\|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\|$ are of order K, this rate is also of order K. We will later take advantage of this non uniformity of the rate by a suitable decomposition of the set $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\} \cap \{\|\underline{n}\| \geq c_{(4.2)}\}$.

4.2 Lemma of the four domains.

In this section, we formulate a lemma and a corollary of it which will help us to take advantage of the decomposition of the space $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$. We could formulate it in a much more abstract setting. Since K plays no role here, we drop the K dependence, hence $\underline{N}(t)$ stands for $\underline{N}^K(t)$, $\mathcal{L}$ for $\mathcal{L}_K$, etc.



Figure 2: The four domains

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{D}_{-2}, \mathcal{D}_{-1}, \mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1$ be subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{D}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{D}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{D}_{-1} \subsetneq \mathcal{D}_{-2} \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\} \,,$$

with $\mathcal{D}_{-2}$ a compact subset. Next, let

$$\mathcal{H}_{-2} = \mathcal{D}_{-2} \backslash \mathcal{D}_{-1} \,, \quad \mathcal{H}_{-1} = \mathcal{D}_{-1} \backslash \mathcal{D}_0 \,, \quad \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{D}_0 \backslash \mathcal{D}_1 \,.$$

(See Figure 2.) Assume that for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{H}_0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}} < \infty\big) = 1 \,,$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{-2} \cap \mathcal{D}_1 = \emptyset \quad \textit{and} \quad \{\underline{n} : d(\underline{n}, \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_{-1}) = 1\} \subset \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{H}_{-2}.$$

Assume that there exists a positive function ψ defined in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ such that

$$\Lambda := - \sup_{\mathcal{H}_{-2} \cup \mathcal{H}_{-1} \cup \mathcal{H}_0} \frac{\mathcal{L}\psi(\underline{n})}{\psi(\underline{n})} > 0.$$

Let

$$a_0 = \sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{H}_0} \psi(\underline{n}), \quad a''_{-2} = \inf_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{H}_{-2}} \psi(\underline{n}) \quad \textit{and} \quad a'_{-1} = \inf_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \cup \mathcal{H}_0} \psi(\underline{n}).$$

Assume that $a_0/a''_{-2} < 1$. Then

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{D}_1} \le t \,,\, \tau_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}} > \tau_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big) \ge 1 - \frac{a_0}{a''_{-2}} - \frac{a_0}{a'_{-1}} \; \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda t} \,.$$

Note that $a_0/a'_{-1} \ge 1$. In practice we will use for $\mathcal{H}_{-2}$ some kind of outer boundary of $\mathcal{D}_{-1}$.

Proof. Using Dynkin's formula, we have for a path issued from $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{H}_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{e}^{\Lambda\left(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\right)}\ \psi\big(\underline{N}(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})\big)\\
&\qquad=\int_0^{t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}}\mathrm{e}^{\Lambda s}\left(\Lambda\psi(\underline{N}(s))+\mathcal{L}\psi(\underline{N}(s))\right)\mathrm{d}s+\mathcal{M}(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\big(\mathcal{M}(\cdot\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})\big)_{t\geq 0}$ is a martingale. Using the assumptions and the fact that ψ is bounded by a_0 on $\mathcal{H}_0$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\Lambda\left(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\right)}\ \psi\big(\underline{N}(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})\big)\right]\leq\psi\big(\underline{n}\big)\leq a_0. \tag{4.3}$$

Since ψ is positive we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0&\geq\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\psi\big(\underline{N}(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})\big)\right]\\
&\geq\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\psi\big(\underline{N}(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})\big)\ \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\geq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\leq t\}}\right]\\
&=\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\psi\big(\underline{N}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}})\big)\ \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\geq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\leq t\}}\right]\\
&\geq a''_{-2}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\geq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\,,\,\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\leq t\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting t tend to infinity and using our hypothesis (and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem) we get that for all $\underline{n}\in\mathcal{H}_0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\leq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big)\leq\frac{a_0}{a''_{-2}}\,.$$

Using again (4.3) we also have that for all $\underline{n}\in\mathcal{H}_0$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\Lambda t}\,\psi\big(\underline{N}(t)\big)\ \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}>t\right\}}\right]\leq a_0,$$

which implies that for all $t\geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}>t\right)\leq\frac{a_0}{a'_{-1}}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda t}\,.$$

We have for all $\underline{n}\in\mathcal{H}_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\leq t\,,\,\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big)&=\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big)-\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}>t\,,\,\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big)\\
&=1-\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}\leq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big)-\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}>t\big).
\end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows from the above estimates. □

Corollary 4.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.3 we have*

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in\mathcal{H}_0}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\leq t_{\mathcal{D}_1}\,,\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}}>\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_1}\big)\geq 1-\eta_{\mathcal{D}_1}$$

with

$$t_{\mathcal{D}_1}=\frac{1}{\Lambda}\,\log\left(\frac{a''_{-2}}{a'_{-1}}\right)\quad\textit{and}\quad\eta_{\mathcal{D}_1}=\frac{2a_0}{a''_{-2}}\,.$$

The estimate also holds with

$$\eta_{\mathcal{D}_1}=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{a_0}{2\,a''_{-2}}$$

and

$$t_{\mathcal{D}_1}=-\frac{1}{\Lambda}\,\log\left(\frac{a'_{-1}}{2\,a_0}\left(1-\frac{a_0}{a''_{-2}}\right)\right).$$

5 Proof of Theorem 3.1.

5.1 Plan for the proof: checking conditions (A1) and (A2)

Our proof relies on a general theorem proved in [2]. We formulate it in our setting. Let $(\underline{N}^K(t), t \geq 0)$ be the birth-and-death process defined above. Suppose there exists a probability measure ν on E such that

- There exist $t_0, c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in \cdot \,|\, t_0 < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) \geq c_1\, \nu(\cdot),\ \forall \underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}. \tag{A1}$$

- There exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu}(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}) \geq c_2\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}),\ \forall \underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\},\ \forall t \geq 0. \tag{A2}$$

Then there exists a unique quasi-stationary distribution $\mathfrak{m}_K$ such that for every initial distribution μ,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\underline{N}^K(t) \in \cdot \,|\, t < \tau_{\underline{0}}) - \mathfrak{m}_K(\cdot)\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 2(1 - c_1 c_2)^{t/t_0}.$$

We shall take ν as the uniform probability measure supported on a ball centered at $\underline{n}^*$ with radius of order $\sqrt{K}$. We shall also prove that c_1 and c_2 are independent of K, and that t_0 is of order $\log K$.

5.2 Proof of Condition (A1)

Let

$$\Delta = \mathcal{B}\big(\underline{n}^*, 2\,\rho_{(4.2)}\sqrt{K}\,\big), \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\underline{n}, r)$ denotes the ball centered in $\underline{n}$ with radius r and $\rho_{(4.2)}$ the constant introduced in Corollary 4.2. Since $\underline{n}^*$ is of order K, the set Δ is included in the interior of $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ for K large enough.

Notation. *We shall denote by ν the uniform probability measure supported on Δ.*

This discrete measure thus gives each point of Δ a mass of order $K^{-d/2}$.

The proof of Condition (A1) relies on the following three lemmas whose proofs are given later on.

The first lemma shows that the descent (from infinity) into the set Δ happens with a time scale of at most $\log K$.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists $C_{(5.1)} > 0$ and $\eta_{(5.1)} < 1$ such that for all K large enough*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \Delta^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\Delta} < C_{(5.1)} \log K\big) \geq 1 - \eta_{(5.1)}.$$

The second lemma shows that on time scale $\log K$, the process starting in Δ stays near Δ.

Lemma 5.2. *There exists $C_{(5.2)} > 2\,\rho_{(4.2)}$ and $\eta_{(5.2)} < 1$ such that for all K large enough*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \Delta} \inf_{0 \leq t \leq C_{(5.1)} \log K + 1} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t) \in \Delta'\big) \geq 1 - \eta_{(5.2)},$$

where

$$\Delta' = \mathcal{B}\big(\underline{n}^*, C_{(5.2)}\sqrt{K}\,\big) \supset \Delta.$$

The third lemma says that the uniform measure on Δ is a significant component of the distribution of the process at time 1 starting near Δ. This lemma does not seem to be available in the literature. The main difference with existing results (see for instance [5]) is that our generator is not symmetric.

Lemma 5.3. *There exists $\eta_{(5.3)} < 1$ such that for all K large enough and all $A \subset \Delta$*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \Delta'} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(1) \in A\big) \geq (1 - \eta_{(5.3)})\, \nu(A),$$

where Δ' is defined in Lemma 5.2.

Proof of Condition (A1). Applying the three preceding lemmas, we can prove that condition (A1) holds for K large enough with

$$c_1 = (1 - \eta_{(5.1)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.2)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.3)}) < 1, \tag{5.2}$$
$$t_0 = t_0(K) = 1 + C_{(5.1)} \log K . t_0(K) \tag{5.3}$$

Indeed, for all $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ and for all $A \subset \Delta$ we can write

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in A\big) = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_A\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0)\big)\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)} \log K\}}\, \mathbb{1}_A\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0)\big)\right].$$

Now by the Markov property we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in A\big) \\
&\quad \geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)} \log K\}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\big[\mathbb{1}_A\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0 - \tau_\Delta)\big)\big]\right] \\
&\quad \geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)} \log K\}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\Big[\mathbb{1}_{\Delta'}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0 - \tau_\Delta - 1)\big)\, Y_{A,\Delta}(t_0)\Big]\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$Y_{A,\Delta}(t_0) = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{N}^K(t_0 - \tau_\Delta - 1)}\big[\mathbb{1}_A\big(\underline{N}^K(1)\big)\big].$$

Using successively Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.1 we get

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in A\big) \geq (1 - \eta_{(5.1)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.2)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.3)})\,\nu(A). \tag{5.4}$$

Since $\underline{0}$ is an absorbing point we have $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in A, \tau_{\underline{0}} \leq t_0\big) = 0$, and using the trivial estimate $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_0\big) \leq 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in A \,\big|\, \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_0\big) &\geq \frac{(1 - \eta_{(5.1)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.2)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.3)})}{\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_0\big)}\, \nu(A) \\
&\geq (1 - \eta_{(5.1)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.2)})\,(1 - \eta_{(5.3)})\, \nu(A).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proved that Condition (A1) holds.

5.3 Proof of Lemma 5.1

The proof of Lemma 5.1 is based on the fine description of the trajectories of the process. For this purpose, we need to introduce a decomposition of $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ according to the different time scales at which the process descent from infinity to Δ.

Let

$$R_* = \frac{1}{2}\left(R + \sup_{y \in P_L \cap \mathbb{R}^d_+} \|y - \underline{x}^*\|\right),$$

where P_L is the hyperplane defined in (2.1).

Note that $R_* < R$ by hypothesis (H4). We define the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_1 &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \sum_{j=1}^d n_j > LK\right\} \\
H_{-5} &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : R_*\, K \le \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < RK\right\} \\
H_{-4} &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \sum_{j=1}^d n_j > LK\,,\ \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < R_* K\right\} \\
H_{-3} &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \sum_{j=1}^d n_j \le LK\,,\ \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| \ge \|\underline{n}^*\| - c_{(4.2)}\right\} \\
H_{-2} &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)} + 4) \le \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < \|\underline{n}^*\| - c_{(4.2)}\right\} \\
H_{-1} &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)} + 8) \le \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)} + 4)\right\} \\
H_0 &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)} + 12) \le \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)} + 8)\right\} \\
\mathcal{E}_2 &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \|\underline{n}\| < c_{(4.2)} + 17\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

They are well-defined provided that K is large enough.

The proof of Lemma 5.1 will result from a series of sublemmas which quantify the probability of coming down from infinity and of crossing the various level sets of the Lyapunov function.

Sublemma 5.4. *There exist two constants $t_{(5.4)} > 0$ and $\eta_{(5.4)} < 1$ (independent of K) such that for K large enough*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \le t_{(5.4)}\right) \ge 1 - \eta_{(5.4)}.$$

Proof. The process $\left(\sum_{j=1}^d (\underline{N}^K)_j(t), t \ge 0\right)$ can be coupled with a one-dimensional birth-and-death process $(Z(t), t \ge 0)$ with birth rate $\Lambda(m) = KB_{\max}\left(\frac{m}{K}\right)$ and death rate $M(m) = KD_{\min}\left(\frac{m}{K}\right)$. The coupling is such that

$$Z(t) \ge \sum_{j=1}^d (\underline{N}^K)_j(t) \quad \text{if} \quad Z(0) \ge \sum_{j=1}^d (\underline{N}^K)_j(0).$$

Let us introduce $p_K = \lfloor LK \rfloor$ and denote by $\widehat{\tau}_{p_K}$ its hitting time. We are going to prove that $A_K := \sup_{p > p_K} \mathbb{E}_p(\widehat{\tau}_{p_K})$ is bounded uniformly in K. As shown in [12, p.384] or in [1, Chap.3], one has

$$A_K = \sum_{m=p_K+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{M(m)} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(m)\cdots\Lambda(i-1)}{M(m)\cdots M(i)}\right).$$

By assumption (H5), for $q \ge p_K$, $\Lambda(q)/M(q) \le 1/2$. Then

$$A_K \le \sum_{m=p_K+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{M(m)} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{m-i}}{M(i)}\right) \le 2 \sum_{m=p_K+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M(m)},$$



Figure 3: The various subsets when $d = 2$ when K is large enough.

where we have interchanged the order of the sums to get the second inequality. By Hypothesis (H6), we know that

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{m=p_K+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{D_{\min}(\frac{m}{K})} \xrightarrow[K\to\infty]{} \int_L^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{D_{\min}(s)} < +\infty.$$

Then there exists K_0 such that for all $K \geq K_0$, for all $p \geq p_K$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_p(\widehat{\tau}_{p_K}) \leq 3 \int_L^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{D_{\min}(s)}.$$

The result follows by Markov inequality with

$$t_{(5.4)} = 6 \int_L^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{D_{\min}(s)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{(5.4)} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

Sublemma 5.5. *There exist two constants $t_{(5.5)} > 0$ and $\eta_{(5.5)} < 1$ (independent of K) such that for K large enough*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in H_{-3} \cup H_{-2} \cup H_{-1}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{H_0} \leq t_{(5.5)}\big) \geq 1 - \eta_{(5.5)} \, .$$

Proof. We define

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{-2} &= \big\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} \, : \, \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < RK\big\} \\
D_{-1} &= \big\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} \, : \, \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < R_* K\big\} \\
D_0 &= \left\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} \, : \, \sum_{j=1}^d n_j \leq LK\right\} \\
D_1 &= \big\{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \backslash \{\underline{0}\} \, : \, \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| < \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)} + 8)\big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

We now apply Corollary 4.4 with $\mathcal{D}_i = D_i$, $i = -2, -1, 0, 1$. For K large enough and using (H4), the Lyapunov function φ defined in Theorem 4.1 and the geometry of the sets, we have

$$\frac{a''_{-2}}{a'_{-1}} \leq \mathrm{e}^{\mathcal{O}(1)K} \, , \quad \frac{a_0}{a''_{-2}} < \frac{1}{4}.$$

Moreover we have

$$\Lambda = \mathcal{O}(1)K$$

by Theorem 4.1. The result follows since $H_{-3} \cup H_{-2} \cup H_{-1} = D_0 \backslash D_1$ and since for K large enough, D_1 can be reached from $D_0 \backslash D_1$ only through H_0. □

We need a specific estimate around $\underline{0}$ since the previous ideas don't work there.

Sublemma 5.6. *There exists $\eta_{(5.6)} < 1$ (independent of K) such that for K large enough*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_2 \backslash D_1} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{H_0} \leq 1\big) \geq 1 - \eta_{(5.6)} \, .$$

Proof. For all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_2 \backslash D_1$, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, there exists $s \leq 17$, such that $\underline{n} + s\underline{e}^{(j)} \in H_0$. Since $\underline{n} \neq \underline{0}$, there exists j_0 with $n_{j_0} > 0$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V} = \big\{\underline{m}(t), t_0 = 0, \exists t_1 < \frac{1}{s}, \ldots, t_s < \frac{1}{s} \quad &\text{such that} \\
\underline{m}(t) = \underline{n} + q\,\underline{e}^{(j_0)}, \forall t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}, 0 \leq q \leq s-1\big\}&.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the probability for the birth and death process to belong to $\mathcal{V}$. Note that by assumption

$$K B_{j_0}\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^d n_\ell \, \partial_{x_\ell} B_{j_0}(0) \, + \, \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K}\right)$$

and

$$K D_{j_0}\left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^d n_\ell \, \partial_{x_\ell} D_{j_0}(0) \, + \, \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K}\right).$$

Therefore, for K large enough, the birth probability of an individual with type j_0 is bounded below by

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in\mathcal{E}_2} \frac{KB_j(\frac{\underline{n}}{K})}{K\sum_{\ell=1}^d B_\ell(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}) + K\sum_{\ell=1}^d D_\ell(\frac{\underline{n}}{K})} \\ > \frac{1}{2}\inf_{\underline{n}\in\mathcal{E}_2} \frac{\partial_{x_{j_0}} B_{j_0}(0)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d n_\ell\,\partial_{x_\ell} B_{j_0}(0) + \sum_{\ell=1}^d n_\ell\,\partial_{x_\ell} D_{j_0}(0)} = \zeta,$$

and $\zeta > 0$ by (H8) and since $\max_{1\le\ell\le d} n_\ell \le 17$ for $\underline{n}\in\mathcal{E}_2$. Note also that the denominator (which is the jump rate) is bounded below by $\zeta' = \inf_j \partial_{x_j} B_j(0) > 0$ by (H8).

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(N^K \in \mathcal{V}) \ge \zeta^s\Big(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\zeta'/s}\Big)^s \ge \zeta^{17}\Big(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\zeta'/17}\Big)^{17}.$$

The results follows. □

In the following lemma we will partition more finely the disk D_1 to fit as well as possible the speed of decrease of the distance between the process and $\underline{n}^*$.

Sublemma 5.7. *There exists two constants $t_{(5.7)} > 0$ and $\eta_{(5.7)} < 1$ such that for K large enough*

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in D_1\setminus\Delta} \mathbb{P}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t_{(5.7)}\,\log K\big) \ge 1-\eta_{(5.7)},$$

where Δ is defined in (5.1) *and D_1 in* (5.5).

Proof. We start by defining a decreasing (finite) sequence of numbers (R_j) as follows:

$$R_{-2} = \|\underline{n}^*\| - c_{(4.2)},\ R_{-1} = \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)}+4),$$
$$R_0 = \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)}+8),\ R_1 = \|\underline{n}^*\| - (c_{(4.2)}+12).$$

Define

$$j_* = \inf\left\{j : R_1 - 2^{j-1} + 1 \le \frac{1}{2}\inf_\ell n^*_\ell\right\}.$$

Note that $j_* = \mathcal{O}(1)\log K$. For $2 \le j \le j_*$ we define

$$R_j = R_1 - 2^{j-1} + 1.$$

Note that for $1 \le j \le j_*$, $R_j \ge R_{j^*} = \mathcal{O}(1)K$. Define

$$j_{**} = \sup\{j > j^* : R_{j^*}\,2^{-(j-j^*)} > \rho_{(4.2)}\sqrt{K}\} - 1.$$

Note that $j_{**} = \mathcal{O}(1)\log K$. For $j^* \le j \le j^{**}+1$, let

$$R_j = R_{j^*}\,2^{-(j-j^*)}.$$

Note that $\rho_{(4.2)}\sqrt{K} \le R_{j^{**}-1} \le 2\rho_{(4.2)}\sqrt{K}$ and that for $j \le j^*$, $\mathcal{B}(\underline{n}^*, R_j) \subset \mathcal{B}(\underline{0}, \|n^*\|/2)^c$. We now define a (finite) decreasing sequence of domains $(D_j)_{-2\le j\le j_{**}+1}$ by

$$D_j = \mathcal{B}(\underline{n}^*, R_j) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \{\underline{0}\}\ .$$

We also define a finite sequence of annuli $(H_j)_{-2\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$H_j = D_j \backslash D_{j+1}.$$

Recall that the Lyapunov function φ has been defined in Theorem 4.1. We define the following sequences of positive numbers:
$(A_j)_{-2\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$A_j = \sup_{\underline{n}\in H_j} \varphi(\underline{n})$$

$(A'_j)_{-1\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$A'_j = \inf_{\underline{n}\in H_j\cup H_{j-1}} \varphi(\underline{n})$$

$(A''_j)_{0\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$A''_j = \inf_{\underline{n}\in H_{j-2}} \varphi(\underline{n})$$

$(\Lambda_j)_{0\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$\Lambda_j = -\sup_{\underline{n}\in H_{j-2}\cup H_{j-1}\cup H_j} \frac{\mathcal{L}_K\varphi(\underline{n})}{\varphi(\underline{n})}.$$

$(\eta_j)_{0\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$\eta_j = \frac{2A_j}{A''_j} \tag{5.6}$$

$(t_j)_{0\le j\le j_{**}}$ by

$$t_j = \frac{1}{\Lambda_j}\log\frac{A''_j}{A'_j}. \tag{5.7}$$

It is left to the reader to check that there exists a constant $c>1$, independent of j and K, such that

$$c^{-1}\exp\left(\frac{\alpha R_j^2}{K}\right) \le A_j \le c\exp\left(\frac{\alpha R_j^2}{K}\right) \tag{5.8}$$

$$c^{-1}\exp\left(\frac{\alpha R_{j+1}^2}{K}\right) \le A'_j \le c\exp\left(\frac{\alpha R_{j+1}^2}{K}\right) \tag{5.9}$$

$$c^{-1}\exp\left(\frac{\alpha R_{j-1}^2}{K}\right) \le A''_j \le c\exp\left(\frac{\alpha R_{j-1}^2}{K}\right). \tag{5.10}$$

If $j\le j_*$, we have by Corollary 4.2

$$\Lambda_j \ge c^{-1}\left(\|\underline{n}^*\| - R_{j-2}\right) \tag{5.11}$$

and if $j_* < j \le j_{**}$ we have by Theorem 4.1

$$\Lambda_j \ge \frac{R_{j+1}^2}{cK}. \tag{5.12}$$

Let us introduce

$$t_s = \sum_{j=0}^{j_{**}} t_j \ , \text{ with } t_j > 0.$$

Using the Markov property and the monotonicity of $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t\big)$ as a function of t, we have for all $0 \le \ell \le j_{**}$,

$$\underline{n} \in D_\ell \backslash D_{\ell+1}$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_\Delta \le \sum_{j=\ell}^{j_{**}} t_j\right) \ge \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_\Delta \le \sum_{j=\ell}^{j_{**}} t_j \ , \ \tau_{D_{\ell+1}} \le t_\ell\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{D_{\ell+1}} \le t_\ell\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_{D_{\ell+1}})}\left(\tau_\Delta \le \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{j_{**}} t_j + t_\ell - \tau_{D_{\ell+1}}\right)\right]$$

$$\ge \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{D_{\ell+1}} \le t_\ell\big) \quad \inf_{\underline{n} \in D_{\ell+1}\backslash D_{\ell+2}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_\Delta \le \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{j_{**}} t_j\right).$$

Using this estimate recursively together with $D_{j_{**}} \subset \Delta$ we obtain for all $\underline{n} \in D_\ell \backslash D_{\ell+1}$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_\Delta \le \sum_{j=\ell}^{j_{**}} t_j\right) \ge \prod_{j=\ell}^{j_{**}} \inf_{\underline{n} \in D_j \backslash D_{j+1}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{D_{j+1}} \le t_j\big) \ .$$

Therefore, from the monotonicity of $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t\big)$ we have for all $\underline{n} \in D_0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t_s\big) \ge \prod_{j=0}^{j_{**}} \inf_{\underline{n} \in D_j \backslash D_{j+1}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{D_{j+1}} \le t_j\big) \ .$$

We now derive a lower bound for each term in the product and an upper bound for each t_j, hence for t_s.

By elementary computations using the explicit form for R_j, (5.7),(5.8), (5.9) (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12), we obtain that for $j = 0$ to $j^{**} + 1$, t_j is of order 1. Therefore

$$\sum_{j=0}^{j^{**}+1} t_j = \mathcal{O}(\log K).$$

One can also check by considering (5.6) that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{j^{**}+1} \eta_j = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

The result follows by applying Corollary 4.4. □

We can now prove Lemma 5.1. We give the proof for $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1$, the other cases are similar and left to the reader. Using Sublemmas 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and the Markov property we have, for all K large enough and all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le (t_{(5.4)} + t_{(5.5)} + t_{(5.7)})\, \log K\big) \ge \eta_{(5.4)}\, \eta_{(5.5)}\, \eta_{(5.7)} \ .$$

The result follows.

5.4 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Sublemma 5.8. *Let*

$$D = \mathcal{B}\Big(\underline{n}^*, \frac{1}{2}\inf_j \underline{n}_j^*\Big) \cap \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\} \tag{5.13}$$

and define $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}(K) = \frac{1}{K}\frac{\min(n_\ell^*)}{2}$.

For K large enough and for all $\underline{n} \in \Delta$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(t > \tau_{D^c}\big) \leq (\mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1)t)\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\tilde{\rho}^2 K} \ .$$

Proof. Let φ defined in (4.1) and $t > 0$. We apply Dynkin's Theorem to $\varphi(\underline{N}^K(\tau_{D^c} \wedge t))$ (in the spirit of the proof of Lemma 4.3). Using Theorem 4.1, we obtain for K large enough

$$\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\tilde{\rho}^2 K}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\tau_{D^c} < t) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1)t$$

and the result follows. □

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We will in fact prove a stronger result with $t \leq K$ which will imply the result if K is large enough.

Let us define the ball $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\underline{n}^*, \frac{2\tilde{\rho}}{3}K)$. Let us consider the function

$$\psi(\underline{n}) = \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\|^2\ \mathbb{1}_{\{\underline{n} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\}}.$$

Assuming $\underline{n}, \underline{n} + \underline{e}^{(j)}, \underline{n} - \underline{e}^{(j)} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and using (2.3), (H0), (H1) and (H3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_K\psi(\underline{n}) \\
&= K\sum_{j=1}^d \Big[2\Big(B_j\Big(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\Big) - D_j\Big(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\Big)\Big)(\underline{n}_j - \underline{n}_j^*) + \Big(B_j\Big(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\Big) + D_j\Big(\frac{\underline{n}}{K}\Big)\Big)\Big] \\
&\leq -\sigma\psi(\underline{n}) + \mathcal{O}(1)\, K + \mathcal{O}(1)\, K^3 \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\underline{n} \in \widetilde{B}$, where $\sigma := \beta\tilde{\rho}$. From Itô's formula and for $t > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\sigma(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c})}\, \psi\big(\underline{N}^K(t \wedge \mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c})\big)\Big] \leq \psi(\underline{N}^K(0)) + \mathcal{O}(1)K\, \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\sigma(t\wedge\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c})} - 1}{\sigma}\right].$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\sigma t}\, \psi\big(\underline{N}^K(t)\big)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c} > t\}}\Big] \leq \psi(\underline{n}) + \mathcal{O}(1)\, \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\sigma t}}{\sigma}\, K.$$

On another hand, for $\forall t \leq K$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\Big[\psi\big(\underline{N}^K(t)\big)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c} < t\}}\Big] \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\, K^3\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\tilde{\rho}^2 K}\ .$$

Therefore, for all $t \leq K$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\big[\psi\big(\underline{N}^K(t)\big)\big] \leq 4\rho_{(4.2)}^2 K + \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\sigma}K + \mathcal{O}(1)K^3\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\tilde{\rho}^2 K}\ .$$

If $\rho' = \sqrt{4\rho^2_{(4.2)}K + \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\sigma} + 1}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\|\underline{N}^K(t) - \underline{n}^*\| > \rho'\sqrt{K}\,\big) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\|\underline{N}^K(t) - \underline{n}^*\| > \rho'\sqrt{K}, \tau_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c} < t\big) + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\|\underline{N}^K(t) - \underline{n}^*\| > \rho'\sqrt{K}, \tau_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^c} > t\big) \\
&\le K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\tilde{\rho}^2 K} + \frac{1}{(\rho')^2 K}\Big(4\rho^2_{(4.2)}K + \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)K}{\sigma}\Big) \le 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Then there are positive constants $C_{(5.14)}$ and $\eta_{(5.14)}$ such that

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in\Delta}\ \inf_{0\le t\le C_{(5.14)}K} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(t) \in \Delta'\big) \ge 1 - \eta_{(5.14)} \tag{5.14}$$

for K large enough and Lemma 5.2 follows. □

5.5 Proof of Lemma 5.3

We first introduce some notations.

$$\lambda(\underline{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \big[B_j(\underline{x}) + D_j(\underline{x})\big] \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_* = \lambda\big(\underline{x}^*\big)\,, \tag{5.15}$$

$$\Lambda\big(\underline{n}\big) = \Lambda\big(\underline{n}, K\big) = K\lambda\big(\underline{n}/K\big) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_* = K\lambda_*\,, \tag{5.16}$$

$$p\big(\underline{n}, \underline{n} + \underline{e}^{(j)}\big) = \frac{B_j\big(\underline{n}/K\big)}{\lambda\big(\underline{n}/K\big)}\,,\ p\big(\underline{n}, \underline{n} - \underline{e}^{(j)}\big) = \frac{D_j\big(\underline{n}/K\big)}{\lambda\big(\underline{n}/K\big)}\,. \tag{5.17}$$

We will compare the process $\underline{N}^K$ in Δ' to the birth-and-death process $\underline{\tilde{N}}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\underline{\tilde{N}}_{t+\mathrm{d}t} = \underline{n} + \underline{e}^{(j)} \,|\, \underline{\tilde{N}}_t = \underline{n}) &= K\,B_j(\underline{x}^*)\mathrm{d}t\,, \\
\mathbb{P}(\underline{\tilde{N}}_{t+\mathrm{d}t} = \underline{n} - \underline{e}^{(j)} \,|\, \underline{\tilde{N}}_t = \underline{n}) &= K\,D_j(\underline{x}^*)\mathrm{d}t.
\end{aligned}$$

The embedded chain will be the symmetric random walk $(\mathfrak{N}_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ with state space $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and transition matrix p^* defined by

$$r_j = p^*\big(\underline{n}, \underline{n} + \underline{e}^{(j)}\big) = \frac{B_j(\underline{x}^*)}{\lambda(\underline{x}^*)} = p^*\big(\underline{n}, \underline{n} - \underline{e}^{(j)}\big) = \frac{D_j(\underline{x}^*)}{\lambda(\underline{x}^*)}. \tag{5.18}$$

To prove Lemma 5.3, we need to obtain a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(N^K(1) = \underline{m}\big)$ with $\underline{n} \in \Delta'$ and $\underline{m} \in \Delta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(N^K(1) = \underline{m}\big) = \sum_q \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}: \\ \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1} \\
\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big) \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \mathrm{e}^{-t_\ell \Lambda(\underline{\gamma}(\ell))}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda(\underline{m})\left(1-\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1} t_\ell\right)} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \mathrm{d}t_\ell.
\end{aligned}$$

We restrict our attention to the paths whose number of jumps between 0 and 1 belongs to $[\,\Lambda_* - \sqrt{K}, \Lambda_* + \sqrt{K}\,]$ (and is then of order K) and whose values

belong to $\mathcal{B}(\underline{n}^*, \sqrt{K}\log K)$. Moreover, we make a change of law and write a kind of Girsanov formula with respect to the law of $\underline{\tilde{N}}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(N^K(1)=\underline{m}\big)\\
&\quad\geq \sum_{q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\log K}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1}\\
&\quad\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)) \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\Lambda(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)) \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \mathrm{e}^{-t_\ell\,\Lambda(\underline{\gamma}(\ell))}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda(\underline{m})\left(1-\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}t_\ell\right)} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell\\
&\quad= \sum_{q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]} \Lambda_*^q\,\mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\log K}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1}\\
&\qquad\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1))\;\Pi_q\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)\;\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\Pi_q=\Pi_q^1\,\Pi_q^2\,\Pi_q^3$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_q^1\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)&=\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\frac{p\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)}{p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)}\\
\Pi_q^2\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)&=\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\frac{\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big)}{\Lambda_*}\;\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{e}^{-t_\ell\left[\Lambda\left(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\right)-\Lambda_*\right]}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Pi_q^3\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)=\mathrm{e}^{-[\Lambda\left(\underline{m}\right)-\Lambda_*]\left(1-\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}t_\ell\right)}\ .$$

The structure of the previous expression is as follows:

$$\sum_{q\in[\,\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}\,]} \mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\Pi_q(\underline{\tilde{N}})\mathbb{1}_{C_q}),\tag{5.19}$$

where C_q describes the restriction of the q states of the process to $\mathcal{B}(\underline{n}^*,\sqrt{K}\log K)$ and $\Pi_q=\Pi_q^1\,\Pi_q^2\,\Pi_q^3$ and $\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}$ denotes the expectation related to the law of the process $\underline{\tilde{N}}$ going from $\underline{n}$ to $\underline{m}$ in q jumps.

Equation (5.19) writes

$$\sum_{q\in[\,\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}\,]} \mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\mathbb{1}_{C_q})\,\frac{\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\Pi_q(\underline{\tilde{N}})\,\mathbb{1}_{C_q})}{\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\mathbb{1}_{C_q})}.$$

To get a lower bound of this expression, we use Jensen's inequality and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{q\in[\,\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}\,]} \mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\Pi_q(\underline{\tilde{N}})\,\mathbb{1}_{C_q})\geq\\
&\qquad\sum_{q\in[\,\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}\,]} \mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\mathbb{1}_{C_q})\,\exp\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\log\Pi_q(\underline{\tilde{N}})\,\mathbb{1}_{C_q})}{\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\mathbb{1}_{C_q})}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing each term with its complete expression, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(N^K(1)=\underline{m}\big) \geq \sum_{q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\,\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]} \Bigg(\mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ \frac{{\Lambda_*}^q}{q!}\ \mathrm{e}^{S_q(\underline{n},\underline{m})}\ \times \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\Bigg) \tag{5.20}$$

with

$$S_q(\underline{n},\underline{m}) = \frac{1}{Z_q(\underline{n},\underline{m})}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ {\Lambda_*}^q \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\log K}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1}$$

$$\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ \log\Pi_q\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)\ \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} dt_\ell$$

and

$$Z_q(\underline{n},\underline{m}) = \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ \frac{{\Lambda_*}^q}{q!} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\log K}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ .$$

Our aim is now to give a lower bound for the right-hand side term in (5.20). It will be deduced from the three next lemmas which show that $\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\mathbb{1}_{C_q}) = Z_q(\underline{n},\underline{m}) \sim_{K\to\infty} 1/K^{(d+1)/2}$ and that $\frac{\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\log\Pi_q(\tilde{N})\,\mathbb{1}_{C_q})}{\mathbb{E}^*_{\underline{n}\to\underline{m},q}(\mathbb{1}_{C_q})} = S_q(\underline{n},\underline{m})$ is of order one uniformly in q.

Let us first give an estimate for $Z_q(\underline{n},\underline{m})$.

Lemma 5.9. *We have the following estimates.*

(i) *There exists a constant $C_{(5.9)}>1$ independent of K such that for K large enough, for all $q\in\big[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}\big]$ and for all $\underline{m}\in\Delta$, $\underline{n}\in\Delta'$*

$$C^{-1}_{(5.9)}\ K^{-d/2-1/2} \leq Z_q(\underline{n},\underline{m}) \leq C_{(5.9)}\ K^{-d/2-1/2}\ .$$

(ii) *There exists a constant $C'_{(5.9)}>0$ independent of K such that for K large enough*

$$\inf_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta' \\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}} \sum_{q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\,\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]} \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ \frac{{\Lambda_*}^q}{q!}\ \times \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big) \geq C'_{(5.9)}\ K^{-d/2}\ . \tag{5.21}$$

Proof. (i) Note first, using Stirling's formula, that for K large enough

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\Lambda_*}}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma} \le \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ \frac{\Lambda_*^q}{q!} \le \frac{2}{\sqrt{\Lambda_*}}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma}$$

where γ is Euler's constant. Then $\mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ \frac{\Lambda_*^q}{q!}$ is of order $1/\sqrt{K}$. Now, we note that for all K large enough and all $q \in [\Lambda_* - \sqrt{K}, \Lambda_* + \sqrt{K}]$

$$\sup_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta' \\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|>\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big) \le \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^2}, \quad (5.22)$$

since from Bonferroni's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta' \\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}} &\sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|>\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big) \\ &\le \sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta'} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q-1} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(|\mathfrak{N}_\ell - \underline{n}^*| > \sqrt{K}\log K\right)\end{aligned}$$

and the use of Hoeffding's inequality.

We deduce that

$$\left| Z_q(\underline{n},\underline{m}) - \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_*}\ \frac{\Lambda_*^q}{q!} \sum_{\underline{\gamma},\ \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big) \right| \le \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^2}.$$

To finish the proof, we apply the local limit theorem [6, Chapter 3] to the the random walk $(\mathfrak{N}_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$. Statement (ii) immediately follows at once from (i). □

Lemma 5.10. *There exists a constant $C_{(5.10)} > 0$ independent of K such that for K large enough*

$$\sup_{q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]} \big|S_q(\underline{n},\underline{m})\big| \le C_{(5.10)}\ .$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\big|S_q(\underline{n},\underline{m})\big| \le K^{d/2}\ q!\ \mathcal{O}(1)\quad \times \\ \left| \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\ \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\le\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1} \right. \\ \left. \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ \log\Pi_q\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)\ \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} dt_\ell \right|.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Pi_q = \Pi_q^1\,\Pi_q^2\,\Pi_q^3$,

$$\log \Pi_q\big(\underline{\gamma}, t_0, \dots, t_{q-1}\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \log \Pi_q^i\big(\underline{\gamma}, t_0, \dots, t_{q-1}\big)$$

and we have to estimate separately the three terms. The result follows from several technical lemmas which are postponed to Section 8. □

It follows from (5.20) and (5.21) and Lemma 5.10 that there exists $\eta_{(5.3)} < 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(N^K(1) = \underline{m}\big) \geq (1 - \eta_{(5.3)})\,\nu(\{m\}),$$

where ν is the measure defined in Subsection 5.2.

5.6 Proof of Condition (A2).

Our aim is to show the existence of a constant c_2 such that for all $t \geq 0$ and $\underline{n} \in \Delta$, $\underline{m} \in \Delta^c$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t) \geq c_2\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t) \tag{5.23}$$

where Δ is defined in (5.1). For all $t \geq 0$ let

$$g(t) = \sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big) \quad \text{and} \quad f(t) = \sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)\,.$$

The proof of Condition (A2) will be the consequence of the four following lemmas which we prove hereafter.

Lemma 5.11. *There exist $\eta > 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\eta\,\delta < 1 \quad (\textit{and then } \delta < 1),$$

and, for all K large enough, there exists $t_* = t_*(K)$ such that

$$\forall t \geq t_*,\ g(t - t_*) \leq \eta g(t)$$

and

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_*\big) < \delta\,.$$

Proof. The proof consists in several steps.

We first show that there exists a constant $\eta_{(5.24)} \in (0,1)$ such that for all K large enough and $t_\Delta = C_{(5.1)} \log K$,

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big) \leq 1 - \eta_{(5.24)}. \tag{5.24}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta > t_\Delta\,,\,\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big) &= \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \leq t_\Delta\,,\,\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big) \\ &\leq 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \leq t_\Delta\,,\,\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big)\,.\end{aligned}$$

We also have, using the Markov property, the monotonicity of $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)$ and Sublemma 5.8

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t_\Delta\,,\, \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big) &= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta \le t_\Delta\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta - \tau_\Delta\big)\right] \\
&\ge \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta \le t_\Delta\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big)\right] \\
&\ge \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t_\Delta\big)\ \inf_{\underline{m}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{D^c} > t_\Delta\big) \\
&\ge \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \le t_\Delta\big)\ \big(1 - (\mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1)t_\Delta)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\,\tilde{\rho}^2 K}\big)\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows for K large enough using Lemma 5.1.

Let us now prove recursively that for K large enough and for all integer q,

$$\sup_{\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\{\underline{0}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > q\,t_\Delta\big) \le (1-\eta_{(5.24)})^q\ . \tag{5.25}$$

The inequality is true for $q = 1$. For $q > 1$, we can write using (5.24)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > q\,t_\Delta\big) &= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta\wedge\tau_{\underline{0}} > (q-1)\,t_\Delta\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K((q-1)t_\Delta)}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_\Delta\big)\right] \\
&\le \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta\wedge\tau_{\underline{0}} > (q-1)\,t_\Delta\}}\right]\ (1-\eta_{(5.24)}) \\
&= (1-\eta_{(5.24)})\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > (q-1)\,t_\Delta\big)
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

By a similar proof as for (5.24), (use first Lemma 5.1 and after the first entrance in Δ use the Markov property and Sublemma 5.8), we also obtain that there exists a number $C_{(5.26)} > 0$ such that for all K large enough

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\{\underline{0}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > K\big) \ge C_{(5.26)}\ . \tag{5.26}$$

It implies that for all $s \ge 0$, for all $\underline{n} \in \Delta$ and for K large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > s + K\big) &= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{\underline{0}} > s\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(s)}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > K\big)\right] \\
&\ge \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > s\big)\ \inf_{\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\{\underline{0}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > K\big) \\
&\ge C_{(5.26)}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > s\big)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Then, for all $s \ge 0$ and all $\underline{n} \in \Delta$, we have $g(s+K) \ge C_{(5.26)}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > s\big)$ and $g(s) \le C_{(5.27)}\ g(s+K)$ with $C_{(5.27)} = C^{-1}_{(5.26)} > 0$. We have thus proved that for all K large enough and all $t \ge K$

$$g(t-K) \le C_{(5.27)}\ g(t)\ . \tag{5.27}$$

Note that $C_{(5.27)}$ is necessarily strictly greater than 1.
Let us now take $t_* = K$ and let q_* be the smallest positive integer such that $(1-\eta_{(5.24)})^q(C_{(5.27)}) < \frac{1}{2}$. We take $\eta = C_{(5.27)}$ and $\delta = (1-\eta_{(5.24)})^{q_*}$. We of course have $\eta\delta < 1$. Inequality (5.27) implies $g(t-t_*) \le \eta g(t)$ for all $t \ge t_*$. Moreover, since for K large enough $q_* t_\Delta < K$ and by (5.25), we have

$$\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_*\big) \le \sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > q_* t_\Delta\big) < (1-\eta_{(5.24)})^{q_*} = \delta.$$

The lemma is proved. □

Lemma 5.12. *With t_*, η and $\delta > 0$ defined in Lemma 5.11, we get for all integer n*

$$f(n\,t_*) \le \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\,\eta}\right)\, g(n\,t_*)\,.$$

Proof. For all $\underline{m} \in \Delta^c$ and $t \ge t_*$ we have using the Markov property

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)\\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t, \tau_\Delta \le t_*\big) + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t, \tau_\Delta > t_*\big)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{m}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta \le t_*\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t - \tau_\Delta\big)\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\underline{m}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta \wedge \tau_{\underline{0}} > t_*\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(t_*)}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t - t_*\big)\right]\\
&\le g(t-t_*) + \delta f(t-t_*) \le \eta\, g(t) + \delta f(t-t_*)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 5.11. This implies for all $n \ge 0$

$$f(n\,t_*) \le \eta\, g(n\,t_*) + \delta\, f((n-1)\,t_*).$$

It is easy to verify recursively that this implies

$$f(n\,t_*) \le\ \delta^n + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\,\eta}\, g(n\,t_*).$$

The result follows by observing that from Lemma 5.11 we have $g(n\,t_*) \ge \eta^{-n}$ for all integers n. □

Lemma 5.13. *With notations of Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.12, for all $t > 0$*

$$f(t) \le \eta\, \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\,\eta}\right)\, g(t)\,.$$

Proof. We first consider the case $t > t_*$. Let $n = [t/t_*]$. We have by Lemma 5.12, the monotonicity of f, Lemma 5.11 and the monotonicity of g

$$\begin{aligned}
f(t) \le f(n\,t_*) &\le \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\,\eta}\right)\, g(n\,t_*) \le \eta\, \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\,\eta}\right)\, g((n+1)\,t_*)\\
&\le \eta\, \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\,\eta}\right)\, g(t)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

For $0 \le t \le t_*$ we have by Lemma 5.11 and using the monotonicity of $g(t)$

$$f(t) \le 1 \le \eta\, g(t_*) \le \eta\, g(t)\,.$$

□

Lemma 5.14. *There exists a constant $0 < C_{(5.14)} < 1$, such that for all K large enough and all $t > 0$ we have*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big) \ge C_{(5.14)} \sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)\,.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_{(5.28)} = 1 + C_{(5.1)}$. With use of Lemma 5.1, (5.14), Lemma 5.3, Sublemma 5.8 and twice the Markov property, we obtain that there exists $C_{(5.28)} > 0$ such that for all K large enough

$$\sup_{\underline{m} \in \Delta} \sup_{\underline{n} \in D} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(\alpha_{(5.28)} \log K) = \underline{m}\big) \ge \frac{C_{(5.28)}}{K^{d/2}}\,. \tag{5.28}$$

Indeed, for $\underline{n} \in D$ and $\alpha' < \alpha_{(5.28)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\underline{N}^K(\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K) = \underline{m}\big) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta < \alpha' \log K\,;\, \underline{N}^K(\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K) = \underline{m}\big)\\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < \alpha' \log K\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(s)}\big(\underline{N}^K(\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K - \tau_\Delta) = \underline{m}\big)\right]\\ &\geq \mathcal{O}(1)\inf_{\underline{m}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\underline{N}^K(\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K - \tau_\Delta - 1) \in \Delta\,;\, \underline{N}^K(\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K - \tau_\Delta) = \underline{m}\big)\end{aligned}$$

and (5.28) follows.

We have for all $\underline{n} \in \Delta$ and all $\underline{m} \in \Delta$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{m}} > \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\log K\big)\\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{m}} > \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\, \log K\,,\, \tau_{D^c} > \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\log K\big)\\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{D^c} < \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\log K\big)\\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\bigcap_{q=1}^{C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}} \Big\{\underline{N}^K(q\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K) \in D\,, \underline{N}^K(q\alpha_{(5.28)}\log K) \neq \underline{m}\Big\}\right)\\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{D^c} < \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\log K\big)\end{aligned}$$

and using the Markov property and (5.28), we obtain

$$\leq \left(1 - \frac{C_{(5.28)}}{K^{d/2}}\right)^{C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}} + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{D^c} < \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\log K\big)\,.$$

Using Sublemma 5.8, we deduce that there exists $\eta_{(5.29)} > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\underline{m}\in\Delta}\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{m}} > \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)} K^{d/2}\log K\big) \leq 1 - \eta_{(5.29)}. \tag{5.29}$$

For all $t > 0$, let us now define

$$\underline{n}_t = \mathrm{argmax}_{\underline{m}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)\,.$$

For $t > \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}\log K$, we have for all $\underline{n} \in \Delta$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big) &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{\underline{n}_t} < \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}\, \log K\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_{\underline{n}_t})}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t - \tau_{\underline{n}_t}\big)\right]\\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{\underline{n}_t} < \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}\, \log K\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_{\underline{n}_t})}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)\right]\\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left[\tau_{\underline{n}_t} < \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}\, \log K\right] \sup_{\underline{m}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big)\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows from (5.29).
For $t \leq \alpha_{(5.28)}\, C_{(5.28)}\, K^{d/2}\, \log K$, we use that

$$\sup_{\underline{m}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t\big) \leq 1$$

and Sublemma 5.8. This concludes the proof of Lemma (5.14). □

Condition (A2) follows immediately using successively the four preceding lemmas. The constant c_2 in (5.23) is given by

$$c_2 = \frac{C_{(5.14)}}{\eta\,\left(1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\delta\eta}\right)} < 1. \tag{5.30}$$

5.7 Proof of Theorem 3.1.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 follows from Conditions (A1) and (A2) using the result in [2]. The constant c is equal to $c_1 c_2 < 1$, where c_1 and c_2 have been defined in (5.2) and (5.30). The number $t_0(K)$ defined in (5.3) is of order $\log K$.

6 Proof of Theorem 3.2.

6.1 Proof of the upper bound

The proof will be the consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Recall that D has been defined in Sublemma 5.8. There exist $K_0 > 0$, $b_{(6.1)} > 0$ and $0 < C_{(6.1)} < 1$ such that for all $K \geq K_0$*

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in D} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}} \left(\tau_{D^c} > \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)} K} \right) \geq C_{(6.1)} \, .$$

Proof. As in the proof of Sublemma 5.8, we use Dynkin's Theorem applied to $\varphi\big(\underline{N}^K(t \wedge \tau_{D^c})\big)$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}} \left[\varphi\big(\underline{N}^K(t \wedge \tau_{D^c})\big) \right] = \varphi(\underline{n}) + \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \mathcal{T}_{D^c}} \mathcal{L}_K \varphi(\underline{N}^K(s)) \, \mathrm{d}s \right] \, . \tag{6.1}$$

We distinguish the cases $\underline{n} \in \Delta$ and $\underline{n} \notin \Delta$.

Let us introduce the set $\widetilde{\Delta} = \{\underline{n} : \|\underline{n} - \underline{n}^*\| \leq \rho_{(4.2)} \sqrt{K}\}$, where the constant $\rho_{(4.2)}$ has been defined in Corollary 4.2.

For an initial state $\underline{n} \in \Delta$, we remark that $\tau_{\widetilde{\Delta}^c} < \tau_{D^c}$. If $t < \tau_{\widetilde{\Delta}^c}$, then Theorem 4.1 yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \mathcal{T}_{D^c}} \mathcal{L}_K \varphi(\underline{N}^K)(s) \, \mathrm{d}s \right] \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \, t.$$

If $t \geq \tau_{\widetilde{\Delta}^c}$, then we can write

$$\int_0^{t \wedge \mathcal{T}_{D^c}} \mathcal{L}_K \varphi(\underline{N}^K(s)) \, \mathrm{d}s = \int_0^{\mathcal{T}^c_{\widetilde{\Delta}}} \mathcal{L}_K \varphi(\underline{N}^K(s)) \, \mathrm{d}s + \int_{\mathcal{T}^c_{\widetilde{\Delta}}}^{t \wedge \mathcal{T}_{D^c}} \mathcal{L}_K \varphi(\underline{N}^K(s)) \, \mathrm{d}s$$

Using Theorem 4.1, we remark that the first term of the rhs is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)\, t$. Corollary 4.2 implies that the second term is non positive. In the other hand,

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \partial D^c} \varphi(\underline{n}) \geq \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K}$$

for some $a_1 > 0$. By (6.1) we finally obtain

$$\mathrm{e}^{a_1 K} \, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}} \left(\tau_{D^c} < t \right) \leq a_0 \, t + \varphi(\underline{n}) \, .$$

Since

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta} \varphi(\underline{n}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

we conclude that for K large enough $\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{D^c} < \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2}\right) < \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in\Delta} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2}\right) > \frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{6.2}$$

For $\underline{n} \in D\backslash\Delta$ we have for K large enough (in particular $\mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2} > C_{(5.1)} \log K$) by Lemma 5.1 and the Markov property and monotonicity of $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\tau_{D^c} \geq t)$ and (6.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2}\right) &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)}\log K\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2} - \tau_\Delta\right)\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)}\log K\}}\ \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2} - C_{(5.1)}\log K\right)\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)}\log K\}}\ \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K(\tau_\Delta)}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq \mathrm{e}^{a_1 K/2}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_\Delta < C_{(5.1)}\log K\big)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Lemma 5.1 with $C_{(6.1)} = \frac{1-\eta_{(5.1)}}{2}$. □

We can now prove the upper bound of Theorem 3.2

$$\lambda_0(K) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-d_2 K}$$

for $d_2 > 0$. For $\underline{n} \in D$ and for all integer $q > 1$ we have by the Markov property

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq q\ \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right) &= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\tau_{D^c} > \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right\}}\, \mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}\left(\mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right)}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq (q-1)\,\mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{D^c} > \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right)\ \inf_{\underline{m}\in D} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq (q-1)\,\mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 6.1 we get for all $q \geq 1$

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in D} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{D^c} \geq q\ \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right) \geq C_{(6.1)}^q\,.$$

Therefore

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in D} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq q\ \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right) \geq C_{(6.1)}^q\,.$$

By Property (A1) proved in Subsection 5.2, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\underline{N}^K(t_0) \in .\right) \geq c_1\,\nu(.)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(t_0 < \tau_0\right).$$

Integrating by $\mathfrak{m}_K$ and using that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(t_0 < \tau_0\right) = e^{-\lambda_0(K)t_0} > 0$, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{m}_K(.) \geq c_1\,\nu(.)\,.$$

Then for all point $\underline{n}_0 \in \Delta$, $\mathfrak{m}_K(\underline{n}_0) \geq c_1\,\nu(\underline{n}_0) > 0$ and integrating by $\mathfrak{m}_K$ we get for all $q \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq q\ \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}\,K}\right) \geq \mathfrak{m}_K(\underline{n}_0)\,C_{(6.1)}^q\,.$$

From (3.1) and this bound we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t\to\infty} -\frac{1}{t}\log \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq t\right) &= \lim_{q\to\infty} -\frac{1}{q\ \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq q\ \mathrm{e}^{b_{(6.1)}K}\right) \\
&\leq -\log C_{(6.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.1)}\,K}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact that, since the limit exists, we can compute it along all diverging sequence. Therefore we have proved the upper bound in Theorem 3.2 with $d_2 = b_{(6.1)}/2$ provided that K is large enough.

6.2 Proof of the lower bound

The proof will result from the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists $b_{(6.2)} > 0$ and $t_{(6.2)} > 0$ independent of K such that for K large enough*

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}} \left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq t_{(6.2)} \right) \leq 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\, K} \ .$$

Recall that $\mathcal{E}_1^c = \left\{ \underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\} : \sum_{j=1}^d n_j \leq LK \right\}$.

Proof. Starting from $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c$, we consider a path from $\underline{n}$ to $\underline{0}$ obtained by decreasing successively the maximum of the components. We denote this path by $(\underline{m}(p))_{0 \leq p \leq Q(\underline{n})}$ with $\underline{m}(0) = \underline{n}$ and $\underline{m}(Q(\underline{n})) = \underline{0}$. We observe that from the construction of $(\underline{m}(p))_{0 \leq p \leq Q(\underline{n})}$, the sequence of integers $\max(\underline{m}_\ell(p))$ is nonincreasing (with jumps of size 1) and can have plateaus of length at most d. Note also that $Q(\underline{n}) \leq dLK$.

Using Hypotheses (H0), (H1) and (H7) there exists $\xi' > 0$ such that for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c$ and for all j such that $n_j = \max_{\ell=1,\ldots,d} n_\ell$,

$$K D_j \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) \geq \xi \, \max(n_\ell) \quad \text{and} \quad K \left(B_j \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) + D_j \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) \right) \leq \xi' \, \max(n_\ell).$$

Therefore,

$$\inf_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c} \inf_{j \in \mathrm{argmax}\, \{n_\ell\}} \frac{D_j \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d \left(B_\ell \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) + D_\ell \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) \right)} \geq \frac{\xi}{d\xi'} > 0.$$

This implies that the probability of the path of the embedded chain is larger than $(\xi / d\xi')^{dLK}$.

If Θ denotes the first jump time of the process, it follows from the above inequalities that for all we have for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c$ and for all $\underline{n}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}} \Big(\Theta < \frac{1}{\xi K} \Big) &= 1 - \exp \left[-\frac{1}{\xi} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \left(B_\ell \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) + D_\ell \left(\frac{\underline{n}}{K} \right) \right) \right] \\ &\geq 1 - \exp \Big(- \frac{\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq d} n_\ell}{K} \Big). \end{aligned}$$

For all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c$, we define a (measurable) set of trajectories $\mathcal{T}_{\underline{n}}$ of the stochastic process by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\underline{n}} = \Bigg\{ \underline{n}(\cdot) \ \Bigg| \ \exists \, s_0 = 0 < s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_{Q(\underline{n})} \, , \, \forall \, 0 \leq p \leq Q(\underline{n}) - 1 \, ,$$

$$s_{p+1} - s_p < \frac{1}{\xi \, K} \, , \text{ and } \underline{n}(t) = \underline{m}(p) \text{ for } t \in [s_p, s_{p+1}[\, , \ \underline{n}(s_{Q(\underline{n})}) = \underline{0} \Bigg\} .$$

Let

$$t_{(6.2)} = \frac{dL}{\xi} \, .$$

Since $Q(\underline{n}) \leq dLK$, we have for all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} < t_{(6.2)}\right) \\
&\quad \geq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathcal{T}_{\underline{n}}) \geq \left(\frac{\xi}{d\xi'}\right)^{dLK} \prod_{p=0}^{Q(\underline{n})-1} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\max_{1\leq \ell \leq d} m_\ell(p)/K}\right) \\
&\quad \geq \left(\frac{\xi}{d\xi'}\right)^{dLK} \left[\prod_{q=1}^{[LK]} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-q/K}\right)\right]^d .
\end{aligned}$$

Let θ be the unique solution of $1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\theta} = \theta/2$. Note that $\theta > 0$ and

$$1 - \mathrm{e}^{-x} \geq \frac{x}{2}, \forall\, x \in [0, \theta]\ ,\ 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-x} \geq 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\theta}, \forall\, x > \theta.$$

For $L > \theta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{q=1}^{\lfloor LK \rfloor} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-q/K}\right) &= \prod_{q=1}^{\lfloor \theta K \rfloor} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-q/K}\right) \prod_{q=1+\lfloor \theta K \rfloor}^{\lfloor LK \rfloor} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-q/K}\right) \\
&\geq 2^{-\lfloor \theta K \rfloor}\ \frac{\lfloor \theta K \rfloor !}{K^{\lfloor \theta K \rfloor}}\ \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\theta}\right)^{\lfloor LK \rfloor - \lfloor \theta K \rfloor} \\
&\geq 2^{-\lfloor \theta K \rfloor}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\lfloor \theta K \rfloor}\ \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\theta}\right)^{\lfloor LK \rfloor - \lfloor \theta K \rfloor}
\end{aligned}$$

using Stirling's formula and K large enough to obtain the last estimate. For $L \leq \theta$ we have by a similar argument

$$\prod_{q=1}^{\lfloor LK \rfloor} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-q/K}\right) \geq 2^{-\lfloor LK \rfloor}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\lfloor LK \rfloor}\ .$$

We finally get

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} < t_{(6.2)}\right) \geq \left(\frac{\xi}{d\,\xi'}\right)^{dLK} (2\,e)^{-d\,K\,(L \wedge \theta)} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\theta}\right)^{d\,(1 + K\,((L-\theta) \vee 0))}\ ,$$

and the result follows since $\frac{\xi}{d\,\xi'} < 1$. □

Lemma 6.3. *There exists $t_{(6.3)} > 0$ independent of K such that for K large enough*

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq t_{(6.3)}\right) \leq 1 - (1 - \eta_{(5.4)})\ \mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.3)}\,K}\ .$$

Proof. Let

$$t_{(6.3)} = t_{(6.2)} + t_{(5.4)}\ .$$

By Lemma 6.2 we have

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1^c} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq t_{(6.3)}\right) \leq 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K}\ .$$

For all $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{E}_1$ using the Markov property we obtain the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.3)}\big) &= \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.3)}\,,\,\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} > t_{(5.4)}\big) + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.3)}\,,\,\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \leq t_{(5.4)}\big) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} > t_{(5.4)}\big) + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.3)}\,,\,\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \leq t_{(5.4)}\big) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} > t_{(5.4)}\big) + \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \leq t_{(5.4)}\}}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c}}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.3)} - \tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c}\big)\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} > t_{(5.4)}\big) + \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \leq t_{(5.4)}\}}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{N}^K_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c}}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.2)}\big)\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} > t_{(5.4)}\big) + \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \leq t_{(5.4)}\big)\,\big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K}\big)
\end{aligned}$$

where we made use of Lemma 6.2. Using Lemma 5.4 we get

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\underline{0}} > t_{(6.3)}\big) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(\tau_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \leq t_{(5.4)}\big)\;\mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K} \leq 1 - (1 - \eta_{(5.4)})\;\mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K}\;.$$

□

We can now prove the lower bound.

Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 3.2. Using Lemma 6.3 and the Markov property we get for all $q \geq 0$

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq q\, t_{(6.3)}\right) \leq \big(1 - (1 - \eta_{(5.4)})\;\mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K}\big)^q\;.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq q\, t_{(6.3)}\right) \leq \big(1 - (1 - \eta_{(5.4)})\;\mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K}\big)^q\;.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t}\;\log \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq t\right) &= \lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{1}{q}\;\log \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\left(\tau_{\underline{0}} \geq q\, t_{(6.3)}\right) \\
&\leq \log\big(1 - (1 - \eta_{(5.4)})\;\mathrm{e}^{-b_{(6.2)}\,K}\big)\;.
\end{aligned}$$

and the lower bound follows by taking for instance

$$d_1 = 1 + b_{(6.2)}\;.$$

□

7 Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.

In the sequel we will assume that K is large enough. We first observe that since $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$ is discrete and countable, the Banach space of bounded complex measures on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$ equipped with the norm of total variation is identical to $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})$. Its dual is therefore $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})$.

We establish a consequence of Theorem 3.1. To simplify the notation we write $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^K$ and $\mathcal{P}^\dagger$ denotes the adjoint semigroup.

Corollary 7.1. *There exists a constant $C_{(7.1)} > 0$ such that for all $K > K_0$, and for any $t > 0$*

$$\left\|\mathcal{R}_t - \mathcal{P}_t^\dagger\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \leq C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_t$ is the rank one operator given by

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_t \mu\,,\, f\rangle = \mathfrak{m}_{\scriptscriptstyle K}(f)\ \mathbb{P}_\mu\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big)\ ,$$

and

$$\omega = \omega(K) = \frac{-\log(1-c)}{t_0(K)} \geq \frac{d_3}{\log K}$$

where $d_3 > 0$ is independent of K.

Proof. If μ is a probability measure, we get from Theorem 3.1 multiplying the estimate by $\mathbb{P}_\mu\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big)$

$$\left\|\mathcal{R}_t\mu - \mathcal{P}_t^\dagger\mu\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \leq \frac{2}{1-c}\ \mathbb{P}_\mu\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big)\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega t} \leq \frac{2}{1-c}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega t}\ .$$

By standard arguments this implies that for any sequence $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})$ we have

$$\left\|\mathcal{R}_t f - \mathcal{P}_t^\dagger f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \leq C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega t}\ \left\|f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})}\ ,$$

with $C_{(7.1)} = 4/(1-c)$. □

We now derive some consequences of this estimate.

Lemma 7.2. *For any $s > 0$, the operator $\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger$ has only one eigenvalue of modulus larger than $\exp(-\omega s)$ which is equal to $\exp(-\lambda_0 s)$. This eigenvalue is simple, the corresponding eigenvector is $\mathfrak{m}_{\scriptscriptstyle K}$.*

Proof. Assume f is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger$ with eigenvalue z such that $|z| > \exp(-\omega s)$. From

$$\mathcal{P}_s^{\dagger\, n} f = z^n\ f\ ,$$

we get using Corollary 7.1 and the semi-group property

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|z^n\ f - \mathcal{R}_{ns} f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_s^{\dagger\, n} f - \mathcal{R}_{ns} f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \\ &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{ns}^\dagger f - \mathcal{R}_{ns} f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \\ &\leq C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-n\,\omega s}\ \left\|f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})}\ .\end{aligned}$$

In other words

$$\left\|f - z^{-n}\, \mathcal{R}_{ns} f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \leq C_{(7.1)}\ |z|^{-n}\ \mathrm{e}^{-n\,\omega\, s}\ \left\|f\right\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})}\ .$$

If $|z| > \exp(-\omega s)$ the right hand side tends to zero when n tends to infinity and f must be proportional to $\mathfrak{m}_{\scriptscriptstyle K}$ (since $\mathcal{R}_{ns} f$ is proportional to $\mathfrak{m}_{\scriptscriptstyle K}$) which is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger$ with eigenvalue $\exp(-\lambda_0 s)$.

We now prove (by contradiction) that the equation

$$\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger f - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0 s}\, f = \mathfrak{m}_{\scriptscriptstyle K}$$

has no solution. Assume there exists such an $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})$ (which is necessarily non zero). We get

$$\mathcal{P}_s^{\dagger\, n} f = n\ \mathrm{e}^{-(n-1)\lambda_0 s}\ \mathfrak{m}_K + \mathrm{e}^{-n\lambda_0 s}\ f\ .$$

Therefore using again Corollary 7.1 and the semi-group property we obtain

$$\Big\| n\, e^{-(n-1)\lambda_0 s}\, \mathfrak{m}_K + e^{-n\lambda_0 s} f - \mathcal{R}_{ns} f \Big\| \leq C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-n\,\omega s}\ \|f\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})}\ ,$$

which implies

$$\big\| f + n\ \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_0 s}\, \mathfrak{m}_K - \mathrm{e}^{n\lambda_0 s}\, \mathcal{R}_{ns} f \big\| \leq C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-n\,(\omega-\lambda_0)\,s}\ .$$

Since $\omega > \lambda_0$ the right hand side tends to zero when n tends to infinity and we deduce that f must be proportional to $\mathfrak{m}_K$, a contradiction. □

The following result completes the description of the spectrum of $\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger$ outside the disk in the complex plane of radius $\exp(-\omega s)$.

Proposition 7.3. *For any $s > 0$ the operator $\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger$ (as an operator in $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})$) has spectral radius $\exp(-\lambda_0\, s)$ and essential spectral radius at most $\exp(-\omega s)$. Outside the disk $|z| \leq \exp(-\omega\, s)$ the spectrum consists of only one simple eigenvalue $\exp(-\lambda_0 s)$ with eigenvector $\mathfrak{m}_K$.*

Proof. From Corollary 7.1 and the semi-group property, we have for any integer n

$$\big\| \mathcal{R}_{ns} - \mathcal{P}_s^{\dagger\, n} \big\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \leq C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-n\,\omega\, s}\ .$$

Therefore since all operators $\mathcal{R}_{ns}$ have rank one and therefore are compact, it follows from Corollaries I.4.9 and I.4.11 in [7] (page 44) that the essential spectral radius of $\mathcal{P}_s^\dagger$ is at most $\exp(-\omega s)$. The rest of the Proposition follows from Lemma 7.2 since outside of the essential spectrum, the spectrum can only consists of isolated eigenvalues with finite algebraic and geometric multiplicities. □

Proposition 7.4. *For any $s > 0$, the operator $\mathcal{P}_s$ acting in $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})$ has spectral radius $\exp(-\lambda_0\, s)$ and essential spectral radius at most $\exp(-\omega s)$. Outside the disk $|z| \leq \exp(-\omega\, s)$ the spectrum consists of only one eigenvalue $\exp(-\lambda_0 s)$ with a simple strictly positive eigenvector $\mathfrak{u}_K$ satisfying $\mathfrak{m}_K(\mathfrak{u}_K) = 1$ and independent of s.*

Proof. The result follows from Theorem IX.1.1 in [7] and Proposition 7.3 except for the properties of the eigenvector. We have (where $\mathbf{1}$ is the constant function one on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{e}^{n\,\lambda_0 s}\ \mathcal{P}_{n\,s} \mathbf{1} = v_s\ ,$$

From $\langle \mathfrak{m}_K\, ,\, \mathbf{1} \rangle = 1$, we conclude that $\langle \mathfrak{m}_K\, ,\, v_s \rangle = 1$, and hence v_s is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{P}_s$ with eigenvalue $\exp(-\lambda_0 s)$. Since the operator $\mathcal{P}_s$ maps positive functions to positive functions we conclude that v_s is positive.

Let $t' > 0$ not being an integer multiple of s. By the semi-group property we have

$$\mathcal{P}_s\big(\mathcal{P}_{t'}\, v_s\big) = \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, s}\, \mathcal{P}_{t'}\, v_s\ .$$

Since $\mathcal{P}_{t'}\, v_s$ is positive and the eigenvalue $\exp(-\lambda_0 s)$ of $\mathcal{P}_s$ is simple, this function must be proportional to v_s. From

$$\langle \mathfrak{m}_K \,,\, \mathcal{P}_{t'} v_s \rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t'}$$

we conclude that

$$\mathcal{P}_{t'}\, v_s = \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t'}\ \ v_s \ .$$

The independence of v_s on s follows and we denote this vector by $\mathfrak{u}_K$. □

Proposition 7.5. *There exists a positive constant $C_{(7.5)}$ such that*

$$\|\mathfrak{u}_K\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})} \le 1 + \mathrm{e}^{-C_{(7.5)}\, K} \ .$$

Moreover

$$\inf_{\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\}} \mathfrak{u}_K(\underline{n}) \ge c \ ,$$

where the constant c is defined in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Form Corollary 7.1 it follows that for any $t > 0$

$$\big\|\mathcal{R}_t^\dagger - \mathcal{P}_t\big\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})} \le C_{(7.1)}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t} \ . \tag{7.1}$$

From the definition of $\mathcal{R}_t$ and $\mathfrak{m}_K(\mathfrak{u}_K) = 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{R}_t^\dagger \mathfrak{u}_K = \mathbb{P}_{(\,\cdot\,)}\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) \ .$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\mathbb{P}_{(\,\cdot\,)}\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t}\, \mathfrak{u}_K\big\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})} &= \big\|\mathcal{R}_t^\dagger \mathfrak{u}_K - \mathcal{P}_t \mathfrak{u}_K\big\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})} \\ &\le C_{(7.1)}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}\ \|\mathfrak{u}_K\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Therefore if t is large enough so that $\exp(-\lambda_0\, t) > C_{(7.1)} \exp(-\omega\, t)$ we obtain

$$\|\mathfrak{u}_K\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})} \le \frac{\big\|\mathbb{P}_{(\,\cdot\,)}\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big)\big\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d\setminus\{\underline{0}\})}}{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t} - C_{(7.1)}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}} \le \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t} - C_{(7.1)}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}} \ .$$

The first result follows by taking $t = K \log K$ since $\lambda_0 = \exp(-\mathcal{O}(1)\, K)$ (see Theorem 3.2) and $\omega = \mathcal{O}(1)/\log K$.

From the positivity of $\mathfrak{u}_K$ and by (5.19) we get (with $t_0 = t_0(K)$)

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t_0}\, \mathfrak{u}_K \ge \mathcal{P}_{t_0}(\mathfrak{u}_K) \ge \mathcal{P}_{t_0}(\mathbb{1}_\Delta \mathfrak{u}_K) \ge c_1\ \nu(\mathfrak{u}_K) \ . \tag{7.3}$$

For any $t > 0$ by integrating both sides of A2 against the positive measure $\mathfrak{m}_K$ we get

$$c_2\ \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t} = c_2\ \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{m}_K}\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) \le \mathbb{P}_\nu\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) = \sum_{\underline{m}} \nu(\underline{m})\ \mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) \ .$$

From the estimate (7.2) and the first result we get

$$c_2\ \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t} \le \sum_{\underline{m}} \nu(\underline{m})\ \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t}\, \mathfrak{u}_K(\underline{m}) + \mathcal{O}(1)\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t} \ .$$

Multiplying by $\exp(\lambda_0\, t)$ and letting t tend to infinity, we get (since $\lambda_0 < \omega$)

$$c_2 \le \nu(\mathfrak{u}_K)\ .$$

The second result follows by combining this estimate with the lower bound (7.3) □

For each $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$ we define

$$p_K(\underline{n}) = \mathfrak{u}_K(\underline{n}) \wedge 1\ .$$

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Using the estimate (7.2) and Proposition 7.5, we get for any $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}\big(t < \tau_{\underline{0}}\big) - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t}\, p_K(\underline{n})\right| &\le \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t}\ \mathrm{e}^{-C_{(7.5)}\, K} + C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}\left(1 + \mathrm{e}^{-C_{(7.5)}\, K}\right)\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{-C_{(7.5)}\, K}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_0\, t} + 2\, C_{(7.1)}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}\ .\end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Corollary 7.1 □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Combining the estimates (7.1) and (7.2) we obtain

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_t - \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}\ \pi_{\scriptscriptstyle K}\right\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\underline{0}\})} \le C_{(7.1)}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\omega\, t}\ \left(2 + \mathrm{e}^{-C_{(7.5)}\, K}\right)\ .$$

Therefore if $\Re z > -\omega$ and $z \neq -\lambda_0(K)$ we have

$$\int_0^\infty \mathcal{P}_t\ \mathrm{e}^{-t\, z}\, \mathrm{d}t = \frac{\pi_{\scriptscriptstyle K}}{z + \lambda_0(K)} + \mathcal{M}_z$$

where $\mathcal{M}_z$ is analytic in $\Re z > -\omega$. The result follows. □

8 Proof of Lemma 5.10

The proof of Lemma 5.10 follows from a series of sublemmas. We first estimate the contribution of Π_q^2 to $S_q(\underline{n}, \underline{m})$.

Sublemma 8.1. *For all K large enough and all $q \in [\,\Lambda_* - \sqrt{K}, \Lambda_* + \sqrt{K}\,]$*

$$\sup_{0\le s\le q}\ \sup_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta'\\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}}\ \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\,\log K}}\ \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ |\underline{\gamma}(s) - \underline{n}^*|^2$$

$$\le \mathcal{O}(1)\ K^{-d/2+1}\ .$$

Proof. We have

$$\sup_{0\le s\le q}\ \sup_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta'\\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}}\ \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\,\log K}}\ \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ |\underline{\gamma}(s) - \underline{n}^*|^2$$

$$\le \sup_{0\le s\le q}\ \sup_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta'\\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}}\ \sum_{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}}\ \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ |\underline{\gamma}(s) - \underline{n}^*|^2.$$

For $0 \le s \le q$ we have

$$\sum_{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ |\underline{\gamma}(s)-\underline{n}^*|^2$$
$$= \sum_{\underline{u}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_s=\underline{u})\,|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*|^2\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{u}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-s}=\underline{m})$$
$$= \sum_{\underline{u}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_s=\underline{u})\,|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*|^2\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-s}=\underline{u})$$

where the second equality follows from the reversibility of the random walk $(\mathfrak{N}_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$. For $s \le q/2$ and from the local limit theorem [6] (applied to $\mathfrak{N}$) we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-s}=\underline{u}) \le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{\underline{\gamma},\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ |\underline{\gamma}(s)-\underline{n}^*|^2 \le$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}} \sum_{\underline{u}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_s=\underline{u})\,|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*|^2 \le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}\,\mathbb{E}_{\underline{0}}\left(|\mathfrak{N}_s+\underline{n}-\underline{n}^*|^2\right) \le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2-1}}.$$

For $s > q/2$ the proof is similar (exchange the role of $\underline{n}$ and $\underline{m}$). □

Sublemma 8.2. *There exists a constant $C_{(8.2)} > 0$ independent of K such that for K large enough and all $q \in [\Lambda_* - \sqrt{K}, \Lambda_* + \sqrt{K}]$*

$$K^{d/2}\,q!\,\Bigg|\sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\le\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)$$
$$\log\Pi_q^2\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell\Bigg| \le C_{(8.2)}\ .$$

Proof. We first observe that for all $0 \le s \le q-1$

$$\int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots t_{q-1}<1} t_s \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell = \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1} t_0 \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell$$

$$= \int_0^1 t_0\,\mathrm{d}t_0 \int\cdots\int_{t_1+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1-t_0}\prod_{\ell=1}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell = \frac{1}{(q-1)!}\int_0^1 t_0\,(1-t_0)^{q-1}\,\mathrm{d}t_0$$
$$\frac{1}{(q-1)!}\left(\int_0^1(1-t_0)^{q-1}\,\mathrm{d}t_0 - \int_0^1(1-t_0)^q\,\mathrm{d}t_0\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{(q-1)!}\ \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{(q+1)}\right) = \frac{1}{(q+1)!}.$$

Therefore we have to estimate

$$K^{d/2} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\, \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\, \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1} |\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\le\sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\ \times$$

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \left[\log\left(\frac{\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big)}{\Lambda_*}\right) - \frac{1}{q+1}\left(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\right)\right]\ .$$

Since $|\underline{\gamma}(\ell) - \underline{n}^*| \le \sqrt{K}\log K$ one has

$$\log\left(\frac{\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big)}{\Lambda_*}\right) = \frac{\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*}{\Lambda_*} - \frac{\big(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\big)^2}{2\,\Lambda_*^2} + \mathcal{O}\big(K^{-3/2}\,(\log K)^3\big)\ .$$

Therefore,

$$\log\left(\frac{\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big)}{\Lambda_*}\right) - \frac{1}{q+1}\left(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\right)$$
$$= \frac{\big(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\big)\,\big(q+1-\Lambda_*\big)}{\Lambda_*\,(q+1)} - \frac{\big(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\big)^2}{2\,\Lambda_*^2} + \mathcal{O}\big(K^{-3/2}\,(\log K)^3\big)\ .$$

This implies using the binomial inequality that

$$\left|\log\left(\frac{\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big)}{\Lambda_*}\right) - \frac{1}{q+1}\left(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\right)\right| \le \frac{\big(q+1-\Lambda_*\big)^2}{2(q+1)^2} + \frac{\big(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\big)^2}{\Lambda_*^2}$$
$$\le \frac{\big(\Lambda\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)\big) - \Lambda_*\big)^2}{\Lambda_*^2} + \mathcal{O}\big(K^{-1}\big)\ .$$

The result follows from Sublemma 8.1, the Lipschitz continuity of λ and the fact that $\lambda(x_*)$ is independent of K. (These quantities are defined in (5.15).) □

Let us now estimate the contribution of Π_q^3 to $S_q(\underline{n}, \underline{m})$.

Sublemma 8.3. *For all K large enough*

$$\sup_{\substack{\underline{w}\in\Delta',\, \underline{v}\in\Delta, \\ 1\le j\le d,\, q/3\le\ell\le q}} \sum_{\underline{u}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{v}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1} = \underline{u})\,\big|\mathbb{P}_{\underline{w}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{w}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u} \pm \underline{e}^{(j)})\big|\,\|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\|$$

$$\le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}.$$

Proof. The reader can check that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{n}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d}\int_{[-\pi,\pi]^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\langle\underline{n},\underline{\theta}\rangle}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\ell S(\underline{\theta})}\ \mathrm{d}\underline{\theta}$$

where

$$S(\underline{\theta}) = -\log\left(2\sum_{m=1}^{d} r_m \cos(\theta_m)\right).$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{\underline{n}} |\mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{n}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{n} \pm \underline{e}^{(j)})| \le \frac{2}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[-\pi,\pi]^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\ell S(\underline{\theta})} \left|\sin\frac{\theta_j}{2}\right| \mathrm{d}\underline{\theta}.$$

Next using a Taylor expansion of S around $\underline{0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{q/3\le\ell\le q} \sup_{\underline{n}} |\mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{n}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{n} \pm \underline{e}^{(j)})| \\
&\quad \le \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)\,(\log K)^2} + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d}\,\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^4}{K}} \int_{\|\underline{\theta}\|\le\frac{\log K}{\sqrt{K}}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{q}{3}\sum_{m=1}^d r_m\theta_m^2}\ |\theta_j|\,\mathrm{d}\underline{\theta} \\
&\quad \le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\substack{\underline{w}\in\Delta',\,\underline{v}\in\Delta,\\ 1\le j\le d,\,q/3\le\ell\le q}} \sum_{\underline{u}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{v}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1} = \underline{u}) \left|\mathbb{P}_{\underline{w}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{w}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u} \pm \underline{e}^{(j)})\right| \|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| \\
&\quad \le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \sup_{\underline{v}\in\Delta} \sup_{q/3\le\ell\le q} \sum_{\underline{u}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{v}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1} = \underline{u})\, \|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| \\
&\quad = \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \sup_{\underline{v}\in\Delta} \sup_{q/3\le\ell\le q} \sum_{\underline{z}} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1} = \underline{z})\, \|\underline{z} + \underline{v} - \underline{n}^*\| \le \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{\frac{d}{2}}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the triangle inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

Sublemma 8.4. *For all K large enough and all $q \in [\Lambda_* - \sqrt{K}, \Lambda_* + \sqrt{K}]$*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{1\le r\le d} \sup_{\substack{\underline{n}\in\Delta'\\ \underline{m}\in\Delta}} \Bigg| \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\log K}} &\prod_{\ell'=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell'), \underline{\gamma}(\ell'+1)\big) \\
&\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d} \frac{1}{K\,r_j}\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r - \underline{n}^*_r)\ \delta_{\gamma_j(\ell+1)-\gamma_j(\ell),1} \\
&\qquad + \mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r - \underline{n}^*_r)\ \delta_{\gamma_j(\ell+1)-\gamma_j(\ell),-1}\Big]\Bigg| \\
&\le \mathcal{O}(1)\,K^{-d/2}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For all $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_s = \underline{u}) &= \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\ \underline{\gamma}(s)=\underline{u}\\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le s-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\log K}} \prod_{\ell'=0}^{s-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell'), \underline{\gamma}(\ell'+1)\big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}}\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{0\le\ell\le s-1}|\mathfrak{N}_\ell-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\log K\}}\ \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathfrak{N}_s=\underline{u}\}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

After a simple cancellation we get

$$\sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma}\,:\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\le\ell\le q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\,\log K}}\ \prod_{\ell'=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell'),\underline{\gamma}(\ell'+1)\big)$$

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}\frac{1}{Kr_j}\Big[\,\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\;\delta_{\gamma_j(\ell+1)-\gamma_j(\ell),1}$$

$$+\,\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\;\delta_{\gamma_j(\ell+1)-\gamma_j(\ell),-1}\Big]$$

$$=\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}\frac{1}{K}\sum_{|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\log K}\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\;\times$$

$$\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{u}+\underline{e}^{(j)}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{m})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{u}-\underline{e}^{(j)}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{m})\Big]$$

$$=\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}\frac{1}{K}\sum_{|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*|<\sqrt{K}\log K}\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\;\times$$

$$\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}+\underline{e}^{(j)})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}-\underline{e}^{(j)})\Big],$$

where we used the reversibility property of $(\mathfrak{N}_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$. Using Sublemmas 8.7 and 8.8 to bound the corrections, it is enough to estimate

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}\frac{1}{K}\sum_{\underline{u}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\;\times$$

$$\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}+\underline{e}^{(j)})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}-\underline{e}^{(j)})\Big].$$

Using Sublemma 8.3 we have

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{2q/3-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}K^{-1}\sum_{\underline{u}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\;\times$$

$$\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}+\underline{e}^{(j)})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}-\underline{e}^{(j)})\Big]$$

$$=\sum_{\ell=0}^{2q/3-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}K^{-1}\sum_{\underline{u}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\;\times$$

$$[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\;+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}^*_r)\,]\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u})+\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}$$

$$=\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}.$$

Indeed, for all $1\le r\le d$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{d}[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}]=0$ since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d}\frac{B_j(\underline{x})+D_j(\underline{x})}{\lambda(\underline{x})}=1.$$

We also have

$$\sum_{\ell=2q/3}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}K^{-1}\sum_{\underline{u}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\times$$
$$\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}_r^*)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}+\underline{e}^{(j)})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{u}_r-\underline{n}_r^*)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{u}-\underline{e}^{(j)})\Big]$$
$$=\sum_{\ell=2q/3}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{r=1}^{d}K^{-1}\sum_{\underline{v}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{v})\times$$
$$\Big[\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{v}_r-\underline{e}_r^{(j)}-\underline{n}_r^*)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{v}-\underline{e}^{(j)})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{v}_r+\underline{e}_r^{(j)}-\underline{n}_r^*)\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{v}+\underline{e}^{(j)})\Big].$$

Using again Sublemma 8.3 and the same cancellation as before this is equal to

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}+\sum_{\ell=2q/3}^{q-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}K^{-1}\sum_{\underline{v}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{m}}(\mathfrak{N}_{q-\ell-1}=\underline{v})\times$$
$$\Big[-\mathfrak{B}_{j,j}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{v}-\underline{e}^{(j)})+\mathfrak{D}_{j,j}\,\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{v}+\underline{e}^{(j)})\Big]=\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}}$$

since

$$\sup_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\sup_{\ell\geq q/3}\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta'}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\leq\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{K^{d/2}},$$

using once again the local limit theorem. □

Sublemma 8.5. *There exists a constant $C_{(8.5)}>0$ independent of K such that for K large enough and all $q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]$*

$$K^{d/2}\,q!\left|\sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\,\log K}}\int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1}\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\right.$$
$$\left.\log\Pi_q^3\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\ldots,t_{q-1}\big)\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell\right|\leq C_{(8.5)}\,.$$

Proof. By a similar computation as in the proof of Sublemma 8.2 we get

$$q!\sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\,\underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\,\underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m}\\ \sup_{1\leq\ell\leq q-1}|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\leq\sqrt{K}\,\log K}}\int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1}\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\quad\times$$
$$\big(\Lambda(\underline{m})-\Lambda_*\big)\Big(1-\sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1}t_\ell\Big)\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\, \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\, \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le \ell\le q-1} |\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\le \sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \big(\Lambda(\underline{m})-\Lambda_*\big)\,\left(1-q\,q!\frac{1}{(q+1)!}\right)\,\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\, \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\, \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le \ell\le q-1} |\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\le \sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \big(\Lambda(\underline{m})-\Lambda_*\big)\,\frac{1}{q+1}\,\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\,.$$

We have since $\underline{m}\in\Delta$

$$K^{-1}\,\big(\Lambda(\underline{m})-\Lambda_*\big)=\big[\lambda(\underline{m}/K)-\lambda(\underline{n}^*/K)\big]=\mathcal{O}\big(K^{-1/2}\big)\,.$$

Since q is of order K we get

$$\left|\frac{\Lambda(\underline{m})-\Lambda_*}{q}\right|\le\mathcal{O}\big(K^{-1/2}\big)\,.$$

The result follows from (5.22) and from the local limit theorem applied to $\mathfrak{N}$. □

Let us finally estimate the contribution of Π_q^1.

Sublemma 8.6. *There exists a constant $C_{(8.6)}>0$ independent of K such that for K large enough and all $q\in[\Lambda_*-\sqrt{K},\Lambda_*+\sqrt{K}]$*

$$K^{d/2}\,q!\,\left|\sum_{\substack{\underline{\gamma},\, \underline{\gamma}(0)=\underline{n},\, \underline{\gamma}(q)=\underline{m} \\ \sup_{1\le \ell\le q-1} |\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|\le \sqrt{K}\,\log K}} \int\cdots\int_{t_0+\cdots+t_{q-1}<1}\,\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1} p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell+1)\big)\right.$$

$$\left.\log\Pi_q^1\big(\underline{\gamma},t_0,\dots,t_{q-1}\big)\prod_{\ell=0}^{q-1}\mathrm{d}t_\ell\right|\le C_{(8.6)}\,.$$

Proof. We have

$$p\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell)+\underline{e}^{(j)}\big)=$$

$$p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell)+\underline{e}^{(j)}\big)+K^{-1}\,\sum_{r=1}^d\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}\,(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r-\underline{n}^*_r)+K^{-2}\,\mathcal{O}\big(|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|^2\big)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{B}_{j,r}=\partial_{x_r}\left(\frac{B_j(\underline{x})}{\lambda(\underline{x})}\right)\Big|_{\underline{x}=\underline{x}^*}.$$

Similarly

$$p\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{e}^{(j)}\big)=$$

$$p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell),\underline{\gamma}(\ell)+\underline{e}^{(j)}\big)+K^{-1}\sum_{r=1}^d\mathfrak{D}_{j,r}\,(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r-\underline{n}^*_r)+K^{-2}\mathcal{O}\big(|\underline{\gamma}(\ell)-\underline{n}^*|^2\big)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{D}_{j,r} = \partial_{x_r} \left(\frac{D_j(\underline{x})}{\lambda(\underline{x})} \right) \Big|_{\underline{x}=\underline{x}^*}.$$

We then have

$$\log \left(\frac{p\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell) + \underline{e}^{(j)}\big)}{p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell) + \underline{e}^{(j)}\big)} \right) = \frac{1}{K\, r_j} \sum_{r=1}^{d} \mathfrak{B}_{j,r} \left(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r - \underline{n}^*_r \right) + K^{-2}\, \mathcal{O}\big(|\underline{\gamma}(\ell) - \underline{n}^*|^2\big),$$

with r_j defined in (5.18), and

$$\log \left(\frac{p\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell) - \underline{e}^{(j)}\big)}{p^*\big(\underline{\gamma}(\ell), \underline{\gamma}(\ell) - \underline{e}^{(j)}\big)} \right) = \frac{1}{K\, r_j} \sum_{r=1}^{d} \mathfrak{D}_{j,r} \left(\underline{\gamma}(\ell)_r - \underline{n}^*_r \right) + K^{-2}\, \mathcal{O}\big(|\underline{\gamma}(\ell) - \underline{n}^*|^2\big).$$

The result follows using Sublemma 8.4 and Sublemma 8.1. □

Sublemma 8.7. *For all K large enough*

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta'} \sup_{q \geq \ell > q/3} \sup_{\|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| < \sqrt{K} \log K} |\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u})|\, \|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^2}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta'} \sup_{q \geq \ell > q/3} \sup_{\|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| < \sqrt{K} \log K} |\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u})|\, \|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| \\
&\qquad \leq \sqrt{K} \log K \sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta'} \sup_{q \geq \ell > q/3} \sup_{\|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| < \sqrt{K} \log K} |\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u})|.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Bonferroni's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathbb{Q}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}) - \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u})\big| &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{\underline{n}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathfrak{N}_s - \underline{n}^*| > \sqrt{K} \log K\}}\, \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u}\}} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}} \left(|(\mathfrak{N}_s)_j - \underline{n}^*_j| > \frac{\sqrt{K} \log K}{d} \right) \\
&= \sum_{s=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{0}} \left(|(\mathfrak{N}_s)_j + \underline{n}_j - \underline{n}^*_j| > \frac{\sqrt{K} \log K}{d} \right) \\
&\leq \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by applying Hoeffding's inequality. □

Sublemma 8.8. *For all K large enough*

$$\sup_{\underline{n} \in \Delta'} \sup_{q \geq \ell > q/3} \sum_{\|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| \geq \sqrt{K} \log K} \mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell = \underline{u})\, \|\underline{u} - \underline{n}^*\| \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^2}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta'}\sup_{q\geq\ell>q/3}\sum_{\|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*\|\geq\sqrt{K}\log K}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\,\|\underline{u}-\underline{n}^*\|\\
&\quad\leq\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta'}\sup_{q\geq\ell>q/3}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{|\underline{u}_j-\underline{n}_j^*|\geq\sqrt{K}\log K/\sqrt{d}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\sum_{k=1}^{d}|\underline{u}_k-\underline{n}_k^*|\\
&\quad=\sup_{\underline{n}\in\Delta'}\sup_{q\geq\ell>q/3}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{|\underline{u}_j-\underline{n}_j^*|\geq\sqrt{K}\log K/\sqrt{d}}\mathbb{P}_{\underline{n}}(\mathfrak{N}_\ell=\underline{u})\,|\underline{u}_k-\underline{n}_k^*|\\
&\quad\leq\mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{O}(1)(\log K)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate can be easily obtained by using again Hoeffding's inequality since $\mathfrak{N}_\ell$ is a sum of independent identically distributed random variables, distinguishing the cases $j=k$ and $j\neq k$. □

A A difference between monotype and multitype birth-and-death processes

In the one-dimensional case [3], the method is based on the existence of a reference measure on $\mathbb{N}^*$ and an associated ℓ^2 space such that the generator $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint in the space. That will not be the case in dimension strictly larger than one for a generator $\mathcal{L}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{L}f(\underline{n})=\sum_{j=1}^{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\underline{n})\big(f(\underline{n}+\underline{e}^{(j)})-f(\underline{n})\big)+\boldsymbol{\mu}_j(\underline{n})\big(f(\underline{n}-\underline{e}^{(j)})-f(\underline{n})\big),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j,\boldsymbol{\mu}_j:\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}\to\mathbb{R}^+$, $\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ and $f:\mathbb{Z}_+^d\to\mathbb{R}$ has finite support.

For a positive measure π on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}$ and two functions $f,g:\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}\to\mathbb{R}$ with finite support, define

$$\langle g,f\rangle_\pi=\sum_{\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}}f(\underline{n})g(\underline{n})\,\pi(\underline{n}).$$

Proposition A.1. *A positive measure π on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}$ satisfies*

$$\langle g,\mathcal{L}f\rangle_\pi=\langle\mathcal{L}g,f\rangle_\pi \tag{A.1}$$

for all f,g with finite support, if and only if

$$\pi(\underline{n})\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\underline{n})=\boldsymbol{\mu}_j\big(\underline{n}+\underline{e}^{(j)}\big)\,\pi\big(\underline{n}+\underline{e}^{(j)}\big),\quad\forall j\in\{1,\dots,d\},\forall\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}.$$

Proof. Equation (A.1) will be satisfied for all functions with finite support if and only if the equality is true for $f=\mathbb{1}_{\underline{p}}$ and $g=\mathbb{1}_{\underline{q}}$ for all $\underline{p}$ and all $\underline{q}$ in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}$. The result follows immediately by direct computations. □

This proposition has a consequence which can be cast in terms of circuits in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d\backslash\{\underline{0}\}$. A circuit $\mathcal{C}$ is a path of the form $\big(\underline{n}^{(1)},\dots,\underline{n}^{(k)},\underline{n}^{(k+1)}\big)$, for some

positive integer k, such that $\underline{n}^{(k+1)} = \underline{n}^{(1)}$ and $\underline{n}^{(\ell+1)} = \underline{n}^{(\ell)} + \underline{\varepsilon}^{(j_\ell)}$, for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, where $\underline{\varepsilon}^j = \pm \underline{e}^{(j)}$, with the constraint that $\underline{\varepsilon}^{(j_1)} + \cdots + \underline{\varepsilon}^{(j_k)} = \underline{0}$. Now define

$$\rho(\underline{\varepsilon}^{(j)}, \underline{n}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\underline{n})}{\boldsymbol{\mu}_j(\underline{n}+\underline{e}^{(j)})} & \text{if} \quad \underline{\varepsilon}^{(j)} = \underline{e}^{(j)} \\ \\ \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_j(\underline{n})}{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\underline{n}-\underline{e}^{(j)})} & \text{if} \quad \underline{\varepsilon}^{(j)} = -\underline{e}^{(j)}. \end{cases}$$

Corollary A.2. *There exists a positive measure π on $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ such that* (A.1) *holds if and only if for all circuits $\mathcal{C}$ contained in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ one has*

$$\prod_{\ell=1}^{k} \rho\big(\underline{\varepsilon}^{(j_\ell)}, \underline{n}^{(\ell)}\big) = 1. \tag{A.2}$$

Proof. The proof is elementary and left to the reader. It is enough to observe that for all $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \backslash \{\underline{0}\}$ and all $1 \leq j \leq d$,

$$\frac{\pi\big(\underline{n} + \underline{\varepsilon}^{(j)}\big)}{\pi(\underline{n})} = \rho\big(\underline{\varepsilon}^{(j)}, \underline{n}\big).$$

□

Condition (A.2) is always satisfied in dimension one, but it imposes very stringent conditions on the demographic parameters in higher dimensions. This is why we had to follow another route in the present work. Let us illustrate this fact in dimension two with the following example modelling two populations with both intra- and inter-specific competition:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_1(n_1, n_2) = \lambda_1 n_1, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_1(n_1, n_2) = n_1(\mu_1 + c_{11} n_1 + c_{12} n_2) \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2(n_1, n_2) = \lambda_2 n_2, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n_1, n_2) = n_2(\mu_2 + c_{21} n_1 + c_{22} n_2) \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

where $\lambda_k, \mu_k, c_{k\ell}$, $k, \ell = 1, 2$, are nonnegative parameters. In this case, condition (A.2) reads

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1(n_1, n_2)}{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1(n_1+1, n_2)} \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2(n_1+1, n_2)}{\boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n_1+1, n_2+1)} \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1(n_1+1, n_2+1)}{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1(n_1, n_2+1)} \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n_1, n_2+1)}{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2(n_1, n_2)} = 1$$

for all $(n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \backslash \{(0,0)\}$. Using (A.3) and assuming that $c_{21} \neq 0$ and $c_{12} \neq 0$, (so we do have inter-specific interactions), condition (A.2) is fulfilled if and only if

$$c_{11} = c_{12}\,, c_{21} = c_{22}\,, \mu_1 c_{21} = \mu_2 c_{12}.$$

If one of these conditions is violated, there is no positive measure satisfying (A.1).

References

[1] L.J.S. Allen. *An introduction to stochastic processes with applications to biology*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, second edition, 2011.

[2] N. Champagnat, D. Villemonais. Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution and Q-process. Probab. Theory Related Fields **164** (2016), Issue 1, pp 243–283.

[3] J.-R. Chazottes, P. Collet, S. Méléard. Sharp asymptotics for the quasi-stationary distribution of birth-and-death processes. Probab. Theory Related Fields **164** (2016), no. 1–2, 285–332.

[4] P. Collet, S. Martínez, J. San Martín. *Quasi-stationary distributions.* Markov chains, diffusions and dynamical systems. Springer, 2013.

[5] T. Coulhon, A. Grigoryan. Pointwise Estimates for Transition Probabilities of Random Walks on Infinite Graphs. In: Grabner P., Woess W. (eds) Fractals in Graz 2001. Trends in Mathematics. Birkhäuser, Basel (2003)

[6] R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples.* Fourth edition. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics **31**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[7] D. Edmunds, W. Evans. *Spectral Theory of Differential Operators.* Oxford University Press, 1987.

[8] E. Hille, S. Phillips. *Functional Analysis and Semi-group.* Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications **31**, 1987.

[9] T.G. Kurtz. Solutions of ordinary differential equations as limits of pure jump Markov processes. J. Appl. Probab. **7** (1970), 49–58.

[10] S. Méléard. *Modèles aléatoires en Ecologie et Evolution.* Mathématiques et Applications 77, Springer 2016.

[11] S. Méléard, D. Villemonais. Quasi-stationary distributions and population processes. *Probab. Surv.* **9** (2012), 340–410.

[12] H. M. Taylor and S. Karlin. *An introduction to stochastic modeling.* Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, third edition, 1998.